arXiv:hep-th/0501013v1 3 Jan 2005

hep-th/0501013
BROWN-HET-1427

Towards S matrices on flat space and pp waves from SYM

Antal Jevicki and Horatiu Nastase

Brown University
Providence, RI, 02912, USA

Abstract

We analyze the possibility of extracting S matrices on pp waves and flat space from SYM correlators. For pp waves, there is a subtlety in defining S matrices, but we can certainly obtain observables. Only extremal correlators survive the pp wave limit. A first quantized string approach is inconclusive, producing in the simplest form results that vanish in the pp wave limit. We define a procedure to get S matrices from SYM correlators, both for flat space and for pp waves, generalizing a procedure due to Giddings. We analyze nonrenormalized correlators: 2 and 3 -point functions and extremal correlators. For the extremal 3-point function, the SYM and AdS results for the S matrix match for the angular dependence, but the energy dependence doesn't.

1 Introduction

One can understand holography rather straightforwardly in the usual AdS-CFT correspondence [1]. The boundary of global $AdS_5 \times S^5$ space is $S^3 \times R_t$. Supergravity correlators in the bulk, with sources living on the boundary, are the same as SYM correlators on the boundary [2, 3]. SYM operators on the R^4 plane correspond by conformal invariance to states on $S^3 \times R_t$, and are mapped by AdS-CFT to normalizable modes in global $AdS_5 \times S^5$.

The size of $AdS_5 \times S^5$ in string units is given by the 't Hooft coupling, $R/\sqrt{\alpha'} = (g_{YM}^2 N)^{1/4}$, and thus can be varied. Increasing the size of the space will lower string α' corrections, but given that the AdS observables are defined by putting sources on the boundary, it would seem that we will always feel the curvature of space (expressed by the SO(d,2) invariance of AdS_{d+1}, mapped to conformal invariance on the boundary). Yet it should also (intuitively) be possible to obtain a flat space limit, in which in particular one should be able to define S matrices. There were several proposals for how to do this [4, 5, 6, 7, 8], but all suffered from some problems, basically stemming from the difficulty to eliminate the contribution of the boundary in AdS observables, and keep only contribution from a (quasi)flat region of space in the middle of the bulk.

On the other hand, it was found in [9] that one can take a particular limit on the $AdS_5 \times S^5$ space, the Penrose limit, that focuses in on a null geodesic sitting in the middle of AdS_5 and spinning around on the S^5, and understand it from SYM. The point was that we need to take a subsector of SYM, involving operators of large R charge. The issue of holography though is very tricky, since the original AdS-CFT has no reason to apply anymore, as we are focusing in on a region far away from the AdS boundary. The issue generated some confusion [10, 11, 12], but in [13] it was pointed out that for the pp wave correspondence holography works in a different way: One has a map between SYM states on $S^3 \times R_t$, dimensionally reduced on S^3, and the string worldsheet, identifying the SYM time t with the worldsheet time τ of the string, in first quantization or second quantization (string field theory). Many calculations followed exploring this correspondence ([14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20], ... for a more complete list see e.g. [21]), and getting agreement between SYM calculations and string field theory calculations in the pp wave. Thus holography is in this case of a radically different type, linking SYM theory to worldsheet string theory. A different approach was also tried [22, 23, 24], in which holography on the pp wave acts through instantonic (complex) paths that do reach the AdS boundary in the pp wave limit, but that also has its problems.

On the other hand, now that we are actually in the middle of AdS, it is conceivable that we could more easily define S matrices, a fact that we saw was hard before (for taking directly the flat space limit). In fact, as was already noticed in [13], a simple order of magnitude calculation shows agreement between an amplitude obtained from SYM ($\mathcal{A} \sim J^{3/2}/N \delta_{\sum J_i, \sum J_i'}$) and amplitudes (vertices) of S matrix type, i.e. obtained from the pp wave supergravity acting on normalizable wavefunctions ($\mathcal{A} \sim g_s p^{3/2} \delta(\sum p_i - \sum p_i')$). It therefore seems likely that we can define S matrices on pp waves and derive them from SYM. The question of defining S matrices on pp waves was addressed in [25] and it was found that there seems to be a consistent definition at tree level.

There is one more problem with this fact though [*]. Namely, there is a subtlety in the definition of S matrices for massless external states. On the pp wave, string states have

$$-2p^{-}=\mu\sum_{i}N_{0i}+\mu\sum_{i}\sum_{n_i}\sqrt{1+\frac{n_i^2}{(\mu\alpha' p^{+})^2}}=\sum_{i}\frac{p_i^2}{p^{+}}+\frac{M^2}{p^{+}} \tag{1.1}$$

where we have rewritten the first term in terms of discrete momenta p_i that will become continous in the flat space limit of the pp wave ($\mu \to 0$). To construct the S matrix we first construct wavepackets

$$\phi=\sum_{\vec{n}}\int\frac{dp^{-}}{2\pi}\int\frac{dp^{+}}{\sqrt{2p^{+}}}\phi_{\vec{n}}(p^{+},p^{-})\phi_{\vec{n},p^{+},p^{-}}(x^{+},x^{-},x^{i}) \tag{1.2}$$

where $\phi_{\vec{n},p^{+},p^{-}}(x^{+},x^{-},x^{i})$ are the eigenmodes of the wave operator, or equivalently

$$|\phi>=\sum_{\vec{n}}\int\frac{dp^{-}}{2\pi}\int\frac{dp^{+}}{\sqrt{2p^{+}}}\phi_{\vec{n}}(p^{+},p^{-})|\vec{n},p^{+},p^{-}> \tag{1.3}$$

The boundary of the pp wave space is a one dimensional null line, parametrized by x^{+} [13], and so asymptotic states can only be defined in one direction (x^{-}), parametrized by p^{+}. Indeed, in the transverse directions (x^{i}), there is a harmonic oscillator potential, thus states are just parametrized by oscillator numbers, but are not asymptotic, and then the energy p^{-} is derived on-shell from them. Thus [25] define S matrices as scatterings in a two dimensional effective theory (p^{+},p^{-}), with extra discrete indices (oscillators):

$$\mathcal{L}_2=\sum_{\vec{n}}\phi^{*}_{\vec{n}}(p^{+},p^{-})(p^{-}-\mathcal{E}(\vec{n},p^{+}))\phi_{\vec{n}}(p^{+},p^{-})+\mathcal{L}_{int} \tag{1.4}$$

Note though that now the dispersion relation (1.1) at $M=0$ has no p^{+} dependence (in the form after the first equal sign), i.e. $\partial p^{-}/\partial p^{+}=0$ so no group velocity, thus one cannot kick the waves [25]. Another way to spot the problem at M=0 is to try to write down cross sections using the wavepackets. Following what happens in flat space when we use wavepackets to turn S matrices to cross-sections, we see the problem: S matrices have overall momentum delta functions $\delta^{d}(\sum p_i)$, but external particles are on shell, thus integrations are over $d^{d-1}k_j$. Usually, the last integration in $d\sigma$ is of the type

$$\int dp_1\frac{p_1^{d-2}d\Omega}{2E_{1,\vec{p}}}\delta(E_{1,\vec{p}}-...)... \tag{1.5}$$

where the last delta function remains from the S matrices. If E is a function of $\vec{p}$, then the delta function is cancelled, but if not, like for the massless S matrices in our case, the delta function remains in the final result for $d\sigma/d\Omega$, making it infinite.

Our point of view is that first of all, even if it is multiplied by an infinity, the massless S matrix thus defined is still an observable, that one can try to get from SYM. Second, we can always mimic what happens in the flat space limit of the pp wave, as we did in the second equality in (1.1). That is, write down wavepackets in the discrete momenta $p_i = \sqrt{\mu p^+ N_{0i}}$ that localize particles in the x^i directions. As a perturbation around flat space, this should be possible, although it is not clear if it is possible in general (this would amount to having asymptotic states). If this procedure is valid, it would generate the effective p^+ dependence for the massless case in the second line of (1.1).

---

[*] We thank Juan Maldacena for pointing this out to us. See also the Note added in [25]

In this paper, we will try to get the S matrices thus defined from SYM correlators, using a generalization of the procedure put forward by Giddings [8] in the massless AdS case. To our knowledge, there was no direct test of the procedure available, so we will also try to do the simplest case.

We will first explain and expand on ideas from [13], in section 2. Specifically, we will show that as far as extracting pp wave S matrices from SYM, only extremal correlators survive, all other correlators becoming subleading in the limit (cannot be expressed in terms of pp objects alone). This is similar in spirit to the fact that in the limit, only certain operators (BMN) survive from SYM.

In section 3, we will show that the first quantized string calculation in [26], while correct, gives a result that is vanishing in the Penrose limit, and again only extremal correlators will survive. In [26], the correlators $< I^2 | \mathcal{O}^{I_3} | I_1 >$ were analyzed on both AdS and SYM sides, and interpreted as a pp wave string amplitude for a state $|I_1>$ (with $k_1 = \tilde{k}_1 + J$ in SYM) to go into a state $|I_2>$ (with $k_2 = \tilde{k}_2 + J$), by propagating in the perturbed metric produced by O^{I_3} (with $k_3 = \tilde{k}_3$), but this object vanishes in the Penrose limit. We say how one could obtain a nonzero result and show that this forces us towards the string field theory calculation, where p^+ changes, i.e. $J_3 = J_1 - J_2$ of the same order as J_2. In that case, extremality of SYM correlators is forced upon us, as conservation of pp wave momentum p^+.

In section 4 we will explain the Giddings procedure for extracting S matrices from SYM correlators, and generalize it to the case of nonzero AdS mass and then to pp waves. Basically, one needs to turn boundary to bulk propagators in global AdS into normalizable wavefunctions. We show that AdS wavefunctions have the correct flat space and pp wave limits, and also that pp wave wavefunctions go over to flat space wavefunctions.

In section 5 we set out to test the procedure using the correlators known to be non-renormalized: scalar 2 and 3-point functions and extremal correlators. The general 2 and 3-point functions are relevant for the flat space limit, while the large charge extremal correlators are relevant for the pp wave case. We compare in detail the simplest case of extremal 3-point function on both sides.

In section 6 we present our conclusions and avenues for future work. Appendix A offers an overview of correlators and holography in the various coordinates used (Euclidean Poincare, Lorentzian Poincare, Lorentzian global, $(t, \vec{u})$ cylinder). Appendix B contains the expansion of the delta function in spherical harmonics (for comparison with SYM calculations). Appendix C contains identities needed for the limits of AdS wavefunctions, and Appendix D contains the general 3-point function of scalars.

2 Extremal correlators and the Penrose limit

In this section we explain and expand the points made in [13] about the importance of extremal correlators in the Penrose limit.

In order to define S matrices on the pp wave we need to understand the relation between the normalizable modes on the pp wave and states in SYM.

The pp wave metric is

$$ds^2 = 2dx^+dx^- - \mu^2 r^2 (dx^+)^2 + dx^i dx^i \tag{2.1}$$

where $r^2 = x^i x^i$.

The normalized solutions to the wave equation on the pp wave

$$(\Box - m^2)\phi = (2\partial_+\partial_- + \mu^2 r^2 \partial_-^2 + \partial_i^2 - m^2)\phi = 0 \tag{2.2}$$

are

$$\phi = \phi(x^+)\psi(x^-)\psi_T(x_i) = (e^{ip^-x^+})(Be^{ip^+x^-})\prod_i \Big(\frac{(p^+)^{1/4}}{\sqrt{\sqrt{\pi}2^n n!}} e^{-p^+(x_i)^2} H_{n_i}(\sqrt{p^+}x^i)\Big) \tag{2.3}$$

where

$$-2p^+p^- = 2\mu p^+ \sum_{i=1}^{8} (n_i + \frac{1}{2}) + m^2 \tag{2.4}$$

and the normalization constant B depends on the problem. In the gravity calculation in SYM, one takes the noncompact $B_{NC} = 1/\sqrt{p^+}$ delta function (in momentum) normalization. But the pp wave limit comes from the (modified) Penrose limit of AdS, where $p^+ = J/R^2$, as x^- is a circle of radius R^2. Therefore, when we calculate SYM amplitudes rather than gravity amplitudes, we have to use the compact normalization ($\delta_{J_1 J_2}$) for states, thus

$$B_C = \frac{1}{\sqrt{p^+}R} = \frac{B_{NC}}{R} \tag{2.5}$$

and correspondingly gravity amplitudes (noncompact) with m external legs are related to SYM amplitudes (compact) via

$$A_{NC} = R^m A_C \tag{2.6}$$

but we also need to remember to change the momentum conservation delta function according to

$$\delta(p^+_{in} - p^+_{out}) = R^2 \delta_{J_{in},J_{out}} \tag{2.7}$$

A closed string field ϕ in the pp wave background, for definiteness a (massless) graviton mode, will have an interaction (vertex, obtained in this case from expanding the Einstein action) of the type

$$g_s \int d^8 r dx^+ dx^- \phi^2 \Box \phi \tag{2.8}$$

that will give a 3-point function that behaves as (keeping only p^+ factors and dropping the + index)

$$A_{NC} \sim g_s p^{3/2} \delta(p_3 - p_1 - p_2) \tag{2.9}$$

It will convert in SYM variables to

$$A_C \sim \frac{J^{3/2}}{N} \delta_{J_3, J_1+J_2} \tag{2.10}$$

and note that the $p^{3/2}$ behaviour is the unique behaviour that converts into a SYM amplitude, so we chose a representative vertex. Viceversa, the $J^{3/2}/N$ behaviour is the unique SYM behaviour that translates into a closed string 3-point vertex, without extra powers of R that take us away from the Penrose limit (given that we need to have g_s and the delta function).

Any SYM 3 point function that behaves in a different way will not translate into a good pp wave amplitude (but rather into an AdS amplitude, away from the Penrose limit).

The class of SYM correlators that have been proven to be not renormalized is composed of 3 point functions and so called "extremal" scalar correlators, when the number of fields on one operator matches the sum of the others, $k_1 = k_2 + ... + k_n$, or more generally $k_1 + ... + k_n = k_{n+1} + ...k_{n+m}$, which was conjectured in [27] to have a nonrenormalization theorem.

Extremal correlators match with AdS calculations only when one takes into account a certain analytical continuation. Indeed, the AdS calculation for 3 point functions starts with a coefficient for the 3-point vertex that is zero: $\alpha_3 = k_1 + k_2 - k_3 = 0$, but in the AdS 3-point function it gets multiplied by $1/\alpha_3$ [28].

When we take the Penrose limit however, the J momenta become continous (p^+), and the delicate problem of analytic continuation dissappears.

The 3-point function of scalar operators has been evaluated exactly and has a factor of $\sqrt{k_1 k_2 k_3}/N$, thus if all the k's are of order J, the correlator is of order $J^{3/2}/N$ as we claimed that we need, and there would be no problem. There is also an invariant tensor $< \mathcal{C}^{I_1} \mathcal{C}^{I_2} \mathcal{C}^{I_3} >$ that would need to be rescaled, but in the general case it would not bring in new powers of J. However, in the Penrose limit we are interested in operators that have mostly Z insertions (where $Z = \Phi^5 + i\Phi^6$ is a complex scalar) and only a few Φ^i "impurities" (i=1,4), and then we can have new powers of J. We will also complexify the impurities $\Phi = \Phi^1 + i\Phi^2$, $\Phi' = \Phi^3 + i\Phi^4$, but we will generically write Φ.

There is a simple way to see the $J^{3/2}/N$ behaviour. Let's begin with the contraction (overlap amplitude) of between a 2-trace operator

$$\frac{Tr(\Phi Z^{J_1})}{\sqrt{N^{J_1+1}}} \frac{Tr(\Phi Z^{J_2})}{\sqrt{N^{J_2+1}}}(x) \tag{2.11}$$

and the single trace operator (with $J = J_1 + J_2$)

$$\frac{\sum_l \Phi Z^l \Phi Z^{J-l}}{\sqrt{J N^{J+2}}}(z) \tag{2.12}$$

We can see that the non-planar overlap of the two will be of order

$$\frac{J^2}{N\sqrt{J}} \tag{2.13}$$

where the $N\sqrt{J}$ comes from the normalizations and the J^2 comes from a choice where to break the two strings to be glued with respect to their origin. This result was obtained from free SYM overlaps, but this is also what happens in AdS-CFT, and here we just have a limit of that calculation.

Notice that we could have taken just as well instead of the double trace operator two single trace operators at different points,

$$\frac{Tr(\Phi Z^{J_1})}{\sqrt{N^{J_1+1}}}(x)\frac{Tr(\Phi Z^{J_2})}{\sqrt{N^{J_2+1}}}(y) \tag{2.14}$$

and the calculation would go through.

We can easily convince ourselves that this calculation also goes over if we have a_1 insertions in the first trace (J_1), a_2 insertions in the second trace (J_2) and $a = a_1 + a_2$ insertions into the single trace operator, the difference in normalizations being compensated by extra factors from summations. So in the Penrose limit, these "extremal" correlators all give the correct result.

What happens if we go away from extremality? The simplest example is the correlator

$$< \frac{Tr(\Phi Z^{J_1}\Phi)}{\sqrt{J_1 N^{J_1+2}}}(x)\frac{Tr(\bar{\Phi} Z^{J_2})}{\sqrt{N^{J_2+1}}}(y)\frac{Tr(\Phi Z^{J_1+J_2})^*}{\sqrt{N^{J_1+J_2+1}}}(0) > \tag{2.15}$$

where we have dropped the summation in the first operator and wrote the fields in the order of contraction (and the neighbouring Φ and $\bar{\Phi}$ are contracted as well). We need to make one contraction between operators 1 and 2, thus it is a step away from extremality.

To remain in the planar limit (and thus have a 1/N interaction) we need to keep the Φ and $\bar{\Phi}$ as they are, and thus the summation brings in only a factor of J, not J^2, and the norm factors are the same as before, thus the amplitude is of order $\sqrt{J}/N$, down 1/J from the previous.

We can easily convince ourselves that all 3-point non-extremal correlators in the Penrose limit will have the same fate, namely they will be subleading, and as such will not have a gravity interpretation (only away from the limit, in AdS). Moreover, exactly the same argument can be generalized easily to show that only $n+m$-point extremal correlators $k_1 + ... + k_n = k_{n+1} + ... + k_{n+m}$ survive in general.

In the general extremal correlator case, with $n+m = q$, the closed string interaction will be of the type (again, for example, by expanding the Einstein action)

$$g_s^{q-2}\int d^8 r dx^+ dx^- \phi^{q-1}\Box\phi \tag{2.16}$$

which will give a gravity amplitude

$$\mathcal{A}_{NC} \sim g_s^{q-2}\frac{p(p^2)^{q-2}}{p^{q/2}}\delta(\sum_{i=1}^{n} p_i - \sum_{j=1}^{m} p_j) \tag{2.17}$$

that will translate into SYM variables in

$$\mathcal{A}_C \sim (\frac{J^{3/2}}{N})^{q-2}\delta_{\sum_{i=1}^n J_i, \sum_{j=1}^m J_j} \tag{2.18}$$

and that will be what one gets from the extremal SYM correlators as well.

The flat space limit of the pp wave means $\mu \to \infty$. In this limit, $(p^i)^2 = \mu p^+ n_i$ becomes continous and the pp wave supergravity on-shell relation becomes the flat space one, $2p^+p^- = \vec{p}^2 + m^2$.

Similarly, the string modes

$$-2p^- = \mu \sum_i \sum_{n_i} N_{n_i} \sqrt{1 + \frac{n^2}{(\alpha' \mu p^+)^2}} \tag{2.19}$$

become, with the momenta (zero modes) as before (just with a change of notation), $\vec{p}^2 = \sum_i \mu p^+ N_{0,i}$, in the flat space limit

$$-2p^+p^- = \vec{p}^2 + M^2; \quad M^2 = \frac{1}{\alpha'} \sum_i \sum_{n_i} N_{n_i} n_i \tag{2.20}$$

3 The first quantized string approach

In this section, we will show that the calculation in [26] while correct, it gives a result that is vanishing in the pp wave limit, and the only nonzero result comes from extremal SYM correlators. We will also see that it is hard to calculate string S matrices using this approach, but we can say a few general things about it.

In [29], the 2-point functions of normalized chiral operators were given

$$< \mathcal{O}(x_1)\mathcal{O}(x_2) >= \frac{\delta^{I_1 I_2}}{|x_{12}|^{2k}} \tag{3.1}$$

implying a 3-point function

$$< \mathcal{O}(x_1)\mathcal{O}(x_2)\mathcal{O}(x_3) >= \frac{1}{N} \frac{\sqrt{k_1 k_2 k_3} < \mathcal{C}^{I_1}\mathcal{C}^{I_2}\mathcal{C}^{I_3} >}{|x_{12}|^{2\alpha_3} |x_{23}|^{2\alpha_1} |x_{13}|^{2\alpha_2}} \tag{3.2}$$

All of these correlator calculations correspond, as mentioned, to Euclidean Poincare AdS. Here $2\alpha_3 = k_1 + k_2 - k_3$, etc.

As we can see, if all the 3 charges k_i are of order J in the large J limit, and the SO(6) tensor is of order one, then the 3-point function is of order $J^{3/2}/N$. The explicit proof in the previous section and in [13] shows that this is the case for BPS extremal operators (with $k_1 = k_2 + k_3$).

In [26], the case analyzed is $k_1 = \tilde{k}_1 + J, k_2 = \tilde{k}_2 + J, k_3 = \tilde{k}_3$, with tilde quantities kept fixed. The analysis finds the result

$$< \mathcal{O}(x_1)\mathcal{O}(x_2)\mathcal{O}(x_3) >= \frac{J^{1-\tilde{k}_3/2}}{N} \frac{\sqrt{\tilde{k}_1! \tilde{k}_2! \tilde{k}_3}}{\tilde{\alpha}_3!} \frac{< \tilde{\mathcal{C}}^{I_1}\tilde{\mathcal{C}}^{I_2}\tilde{\mathcal{C}}^{I_3} >}{|x_{12}|^{2(J+\tilde{\alpha}_3)} |x_{23}|^{2\tilde{\alpha}_1} |x_{13}|^{2\tilde{\alpha}_2}} \tag{3.3}$$

which we can already see that is subleading with respect to the previous in the large J limit.

As we mentioned, we can take more easily the Penrose limit in the $(t, \vec{u})$ coordinates. Correspondingly, on the boundary we must make the conformal transformation + Wick rotation to the Lorentzian cylinder via $x_i = e^\tau \hat{e}_i, \tau = it$.

The conformal transformation acts as usual also on the boundary CFT operators, such that

$$\mathcal{O}'^I(\tau, \hat{e}_i) = e^{k\tau}\mathcal{O}^I(x) \tag{3.4}$$

and if we choose $-\tau_1 \gg 1$ (x_1 very close the origin so that we can say $|x_{12}| \sim |x_2|$), the 2-point function becomes

$$< \mathcal{O}'^{I_2}\mathcal{O}'^{I_1} >= \delta^{I_1 I_2} e^{-k(\tau_2-\tau_1)} \tag{3.5}$$

which means that the state (on the cylinder), which corresponds to the operator $\mathcal{O}(x)$ is $\mathcal{O}'^I(\tau, \hat{e})|0>= e^{k\tau}|I>$, where $< I_2|I_1 >= \delta^{I_1 I_2}$.

For the 3-point function, [26] chose then to have $-\tau_1 \gg 1$ also, which is to say x_1 was chosen as (very close to) the origin on the plane, which is always possible.

But they also chose in the case of the 3-point function $\tau_2 \gg 1$ (x_2 at infinity), which is not always possible, since we want to keep the metric of $S^3 \times R$ invariant. It is possible to do that by a conformal transformation, but that takes us away from the cylinder.

If one takes nevertheless also $\tau_2 \gg 1$, such that $|x_{12}| \simeq e^{\tau_2} \simeq |x_{23}|, |x_{13}| \simeq e^{\tau_3}$, one then can put the SYM 3 point function in a matrix element form and get

$$< I_2|\mathcal{O}^{I_3}(\tau_3, \hat{e}_3)|I_1 >= \frac{J^{1-\tilde{k}_3/2}}{N} e^{-\tau_3(k_1-k_2)} \frac{\sqrt{\tilde{k}_1!\tilde{k}_2!\tilde{k}_3}}{\tilde{\alpha}_3!} < \tilde{\mathcal{C}}^{I_1}\tilde{\mathcal{C}}^{I_2}\tilde{\mathcal{C}}^{I_3} > \tag{3.6}$$

Again, this result is subleading (proportional to $J^{1-\tilde{k}_3/2}/N$), but as mentioned it is put in a form that looks like a string matrix element. One would think one could rescale $\mathcal{O}_3$ [26], but one can't do that, since it is already normalized!

Turning now to the AdS side, the large J limit becomes the Penrose limit, taken by setting $t = x^+ + x^-/R^2, \psi = x^+ - x^-/R^2, \vec{u} = \vec{w}/R, \vec{v} = \vec{y}/R$.

If one hopes to have the same type of holography as in AdS, one takes the Penrose limit of the bulk to boundary propagator in $(t, \vec{u})$ coordinates, after which the propagator becomes independent of $\vec{u}$ (or $\vec{x}$, or rather $\vec{w}$, after the Penrose limit) as well as $\hat{e}'$, and instead becomes one dimensional dependent (on x^+ and t')

$$K(x^+, x^-, \vec{w}; t', \hat{e}') = \frac{[A(\Delta)]^{1/2}}{2^\Delta cos^\Delta[(1-i\epsilon)(x^+ - t')]} \tag{3.7}$$

This is the propagator from the center of AdS (u=0) to the boundary ($u = \infty$), in the pp limit.

We note here already the problem. The propagator used above connects the boundary with the center of AdS, but the Penrose limit focuses only on the center of AdS, so use of (3.7) should give a zero result.

If one nevertheless takes this propagator and calculates the string scattering, we will see that one still gets a result that is zero in the Penrose limit.

One can use the usual AdS-CFT prescription of Witten to relate the partition functions $Z_{SYM} = Z_{string}$, and as the string partition function can be expressed formally and schematically as

$$Z = \int DX^\mu Dh_{\alpha\beta}...e^{iS} = \int DX^\mu Dh_{\alpha\beta}...e^{iS_0}(1 + \frac{1}{2\pi}\int d^2\sigma\sqrt{h}h^{\alpha\beta}\partial_\alpha X^\mu\partial_\beta X^\nu f_{\mu\nu}(X^\rho) + ...) \tag{3.8}$$

where $f_{\mu\nu}(X^\rho)$ is the graviton wave function, in this case h_{++}, and the nontrivial insertion is the vertex operator for the graviton (however, that is not of definite momentum as usual). It is also equal to

$$S_{int}(h_{++}) = \frac{1}{4\pi\alpha'}\int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} dx^+ \int_0^{2\pi\alpha'|p_-|} d\sigma h_{++}(x^+, y) \tag{3.9}$$

and then

$$\frac{\delta Z}{\delta\phi_0}|_{string} =< I_2|\frac{\delta\ iS_{int}(h_{++})}{\delta\phi_0(x_3)}|I_1 > \tag{3.10}$$

is equal to

$$\frac{\delta Z}{\delta\phi_0}|_{SYM} =< I_2|\mathcal{O}_3(x_3)|I_1 > |_{SYM} \tag{3.11}$$

In the string calculation,

$$\frac{\delta h_{++}}{\delta\phi_0(t', \hat{e}')} \tag{3.12}$$

is related via a rescaling to the bulk to boundary propagator (3.7). The rescaling is performed to give the canonical scalar KK fields of [29], $s^I \sim (R^{3/2}/N)\phi^I$, after which the metric perturbations corresponding to these scalars are calculated. They are $h \sim R^2 k s^I Y^I$ and the final formula is

$$\frac{\delta h_{++}}{\delta\phi_0(t', \hat{e}')} = \frac{R^{2-k_I}(k_I+1)\sqrt{k_I}}{N 2^{k_I/2} cos^{k_I+2}[(1-i\epsilon)(x^+ - t')]}\mathcal{C}^I(\vec{y}) \tag{3.13}$$

(note that in $h_{MN}dx^M dx^N$ only $h_{++} = h_{tt} + h_{\psi\psi}$ survives). Here $k_I = \tilde{k}_3$ so is finite in the pp limit and $R^2 \propto J$, so the string amplitude is $\propto J^{1-\tilde{k}_3/2}/N$, same as the gauge theory amplitude, thus it is not finite.

The final result depends only on the boundary time t_3 (as the $\hat{e}_3$ dependence was lost in the pp limit), and matches the SYM result, however it can't be reexpressed only in pp wave (finite) quantities, since as we saw, it is actually subleading in the limit. One needs explicitly R and N.

So how could we salvage this calculation and get a finite amplitude in the pp wave limit? As we mentioned, we need to take $\mathcal{O}_3$ to have large charge also. If we don't restrict to small charge,

$$\frac{\delta h_{++}}{\delta\phi_0(t', \hat{e}')} = \frac{4R^2}{k+1}(k^2 + \partial_t^2)\frac{\delta s^I}{\delta\phi_0(t', \hat{e}')}Y^I = \frac{R^2(k_I+1)\sqrt{k_I}}{N 2^{k_I/2} cos^{k_I+2}[(1-i\epsilon)(x^+ - t')]}Y^I \tag{3.14}$$

but now we don't have $Y^I = R^{-k}\mathcal{C}(\vec{y})$ but rather

$$Y^I(\psi,\vec{v}) = [\begin{pmatrix} k \\ J \end{pmatrix}]^{1/2} 2^{-J/2} e^{iJ\psi}(1-v^2)^{J/2}\tilde{\mathcal{C}}^I(\vec{v}) \tag{3.15}$$

and since $\tilde{\mathcal{C}}(\vec{v}) = R^{-\tilde{k}}\tilde{\mathcal{C}}(\vec{y})$ we get

$$Y^{I_1} \simeq 2^{-k_1/2}\frac{(p^+)^{\tilde{k}_1/2}}{\sqrt{\tilde{k}_1!}} f(x^+,x^-,\vec{y}) \tag{3.16}$$

It is interesting to note that if we took the limit now on h_{++}, we would get therefore

$$\frac{\delta h_{++}}{\delta\phi_0(t',\hat{e}')} \sim 2^{-J}\frac{J^{5/2}}{N} \tag{3.17}$$

and this is the wrong type of result: if we ignore the 2^{-J} as part of the space dependence, it is too big! ($J^{5/2}/N$ instead of $J^{3/2}/N$).

The reason for this discrepancy is rather sneaky. By taking first $t' = -\infty$ before the Wick rotation and the pp limit, we saw that in the propagator $2^{-k}cos^{-k}(...)$ was replaced by $e^{-ikt}(1+u^2)^{-k/2}$ (see Appendix A and specifically (A.36) for details) and the interesting fact is that (apart from getting rid of the unwanted 2^{-k} factor) now, unlike before, $(k^2 + \partial_t^2)\delta s^I/\delta\phi_0 \sim (k^2+\partial_t^2)K_{B\partial} = 0$ in first order, so we have to look for subleading behaviour in J.

Indeed, as [26] show, one gets

$$\frac{\delta s^{I_1}}{\delta\phi_0}Y^{I_1} = \frac{|p^+|^{\tilde{k}_1/2}\sqrt{J}}{4N\sqrt{\tilde{k}_1!}} e^{-ip^+x^- - i\tilde{k}_1x^+ - |p^+|(w^2+y^2)/4}\tilde{\mathcal{C}}^{I_1}(\vec{y}) \tag{3.18}$$

and now the factors leading to h_{++} $(4R^2/(k+1)(k^2+\partial_t^2))$ don't bring an extra J^2 as before, but rather J, leading to a good

$$h_{++} \sim \frac{J^{3/2}}{N} \tag{3.19}$$

(finite) behaviour.

In conclusion, two things must be done in order to obtain something finite in the pp limit. The first is to take $\mathcal{O}_3$ to have dimension of order J as well (formally, in [26], one went from a $k_3 = \tilde{k}_3$ perturbation to a $k_1 = J + \tilde{k}_1$ perturbation). That already forces us as far as leading behaviour goes to take extremal correlators (as the only ones that behave as $J^{3/2}/N$).

The second is to take propagators where the boundary point has been already put to the origin and use this new propagator.

But in going from the h_{++} of [26] to the finite perturbation , there is a change of interpretation. The first used the bulk to boundary propagator for $\delta h_{++}/\delta\phi_0(t_3,\hat{e}_3)$, namely

$$< 0|s^{I_3}(t,\vec{x})\mathcal{O}^{I_3}(t_3,\hat{e}_3)|0 > \tag{3.20}$$

which contained an operator of finite k_3, therefore can't be mapped to a string state on the pp wave (would have zero p^+), and moreover it still has dependence on the boundary point, therefore the role of O^{I_3} is to couple to a boundary source, thus relating it to the 3-point SYM function $< I_1|\mathcal{O}(t_3,\hat{e}_3)|I_2 >|_{SYM}$.

But in our case,

$$< 0|s^{I_1}(t,\vec{x})\mathcal{O}^{I_1}(-\infty)|0 > \tag{3.21}$$

is mapped to

$$< 0|s^{I_1}|I_1 > (x^+;|w|,x^-,\vec{y}) \tag{3.22}$$

which has no more dependence on the boundary point, defines a state, and depends only on x^+ and coordinates transverse to the boundary.

It is conceivable therefore that there would be a way of constructing a vertex operator of definite momentum along x^+ and integrated as before over the whole space.

Unfortunately, it is not clear how to calculate the finite amplitude in this first quantized string formalism, since p^+ changes in the amplitude ($J_1 = J_2 + J_3$, thus $p_1^+ = p_2^+ + p_3^+$). It is rather a string field theory calculation (which was already done by many people) which makes more sense.

But one sees that however the calculation will be done, the result will be correct. In [26], h_{++} has already the final leading dependence, of $J^{1-\tilde{k}_3/2}/N$, since the evaluation of string oscillators brings only finite quantities, the same as the integrations. In our case, h_{++} is already of order $J^{3/2}/N$, so one just needs the correct prescription for the vertices to get the right result.

4 S matrices from SYM

Set-up

The natural observables in AdS-CFT are correlators. But in flat space we have the LSZ formula that relates them to S matrices (observable),

$$\prod_{i,j}\int d^4x_i e^{ip_ix_i}\int d^4y_j e^{-ik_jy_j} < \Omega|T\{\phi(x_1)...\phi(x_n)\phi(y_1)...\phi(y_m)\}|\Omega >$$

$$\sim \lim_{p_i^0\rightarrow E_{p^i},k_j^0\rightarrow E_{k_j}}(\prod_i\frac{\sqrt{Z_i}i}{p_i^2-m_i^2+i\epsilon})(\prod_j\frac{\sqrt{Z_j}i}{k_j^2-m^2+i\epsilon})S(p_1,...p_n;k_1,...k_m) \tag{4.1}$$

where

$$\int d^4xe^{ipx} < \Omega|T\{\phi(x)\phi(0)\}|\Omega >= \frac{iZ}{p^2-m^2-i\epsilon} \tag{4.2}$$

So amputate the momentum space correlator near on shell and multiply by $\sqrt{Z}$'s and get the S matrix!

That implies a prescription for the AdS case as well. Indeed, as Giddings [8] notices, AdS-CFT takes the form

$$< T(\mathcal{O}(\vec{y}_1)...\mathcal{O}(\vec{y}_2)) >= \int \Pi_i[d^4x_iK_F(\vec{y}_i,x_i)]G_T(x_1,...x_n) \tag{4.3}$$

where K_F is the full multiloop bulk to boundary propagator and G_T is the full amputated bulk n-point function. So if one could define the amputation process and the multiplication by $\sqrt{Z}$ on the boundary correlators, one would have an S matrix. But of course AdS doesn't admit an S matrix, so one has also to take a flat space (or pp wave!) limit.

Moreover, one needs Lorentzian signature to define S matrices, so one needs to go to global AdS where that can be done (in the Poincare patch it is hard, since there we can't change the non-normalizable propagator to a normalizable one as we will do below for global coordinates).

Then one has to define quantities which become in the flat space limit the 5-momentum in Minkowski space. The natural candidate for the energy E is the conjugate to the global time τ. So perform a Fourier transform and identify the variable ω with ER. From the point of the CFT, there remains a unit vector $\hat{e}$, which is however in position space. However, [8] argues it should become the momentum unit vector in AdS. So

$$k_{(5)} = E(1, \hat{e}) \tag{4.4}$$

and so on-shell massless AdS momenta correspond to off-shell CFT momenta. But the discrete AdS states (normalizable modes) still correspond to the discrete states (Δ, n, l) on the cylinder $(\omega = 2h_+ + 2n + l)$. Actually, we can also think of the cylinder states as on-shell, with a discrete set of masses. That is, $(\Delta, n = 0, l)$ are states corresponding on the cylinder to operators on the plane of dimension Δ, while n is an off-shell index which can be identified with ordering a tower $\{\Delta_n\}_n$ of operators. Indeed, we will shortly see that n correponds in the pp wave limit to the radial oscillator number for the transverse (AdS) oscillators, thus on SYM it is identified with the number of Φ_i insertions (non-U(1)-R charged scalars). Thus also in the flat space limit n indexes a tower of operators.

Giddings only made this identification for massless states in AdS, but since we want to take the pp wave limit, we will need to extend it to massive states as well. In that case therefore, at large R, $2n/R = E - m$ and $\Delta/R = m$. We will see shortly that this gives the correct behaviour.

As [8] showed, in the large R limit, the bulk to bulk propagator of AdS space in global coordinates goes over to the flat space propagator. For the bulk to boundary propagator, the discussion is a bit more involved, but before it we need to study the flat space and pp wave limits of wavefunctions. See also [30] for the pp wave limit of supergravity couplings.

Flat space and pp wave limits of wavefunctions

We will look at the harmonic oscillator (the limit in which harmonic oscillator states go over to flat space free waves), since this will be needed to get flat space from the pp wave, then at AdS wavefunctions, both in the flat space and the pp wave limits.

Using the formulas derived in Appendix C, we obtain:

- The harmonic oscillator wavefunctions

$$\phi_n(x) = \frac{(m\omega)^{1/4}}{[\sqrt{\pi} 2^n n!]^{1/2}} e^{-\rho^2/2} H_n(\rho) \tag{4.5}$$

where $\rho = \sqrt{m\omega}x$ become in the large n limit (or flat space limit, $m\omega \to 0$)

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \phi_{2n}(x) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{\pi}}[\frac{4m\omega}{n}]^{1/4} cos(2\sqrt{m\omega n}x) \tag{4.6}$$

which are normalized

$$\int_0^L \phi_{2n}(x)\phi^*_{2p}(x) = \delta_{np} \tag{4.7}$$

with the momentum

$$k_n = \sqrt{2m\omega n} = \frac{2\pi n}{L} \tag{4.8}$$

This calculation is the same one that one needs to prove that the pp wave wavefunctions become free waves in flat space, with $m\omega$ replaced by p^+.

- In the case of AdS wavefunctions, the radial wavefunction is

$$\chi_{nl}(r) = A_{nl}(\cos(r/R))^{\Delta}(\sin(r/R))^l P_n^{l+d/2-1,\nu}(\cos(2r/R)) \tag{4.9}$$

In the general case of the large n, large Δ limit (but small l), $\Delta/R \simeq m$, $2n/R \simeq E - m \equiv E'$ so $2r/R = E'r/n$ and $\nu \simeq n(2m)/E'$. We want to obtain the flat space wavefunctions for massive modes, with $E = E' + m$ and $|\vec{k}| = E'\sqrt{1+\beta}$ Then

$$\chi_{nl}(r) = A_{nl}(\frac{R}{r\sqrt{1+\beta}})^{d/2-1}(1+\beta)^{-l/2} J_{l+d/2-1}(E'r\sqrt{1+\beta}) \tag{4.10}$$

where $\beta = 2m/E'$, gives in the large n and large R limit the flat space wavefunctions in spherical coordinates

$$\phi_{nl\vec{m}}(t,r,\hat{e}) \to \sqrt{2E}(\frac{e^{-iEt}}{\sqrt{2E}})\frac{J_{l+d/2-1}(rE'\sqrt{1+\beta})}{r^{d/2-1}} Y_{l\vec{m}}(\hat{e}) \tag{4.11}$$

That means that its Fourier transform will be

$$\sum_{l\vec{m}} Y_{l\vec{m}}(\hat{e}')\phi_{nl\vec{m}}(t,r,\hat{e}) \propto e^{-iEt}e^{iE'r\sqrt{1+\beta}\hat{e}\hat{e}'} = e^{-iEt+i\vec{k}\vec{x}} \tag{4.12}$$

and where $|\vec{k}| = \sqrt{E^2-m^2} = E'\sqrt{1+\beta}$, thus our identification of E and m was correct.

- To get pp wave wavefunctions from AdS wavefunctions we fix n and l and take $\Delta/R^2 \simeq p^+ =$ fixed. Then we have

$$A_{nl} \to R^{l+1/2}(p^+)^{l/2+d/4}\sqrt{\frac{2n!}{\Gamma(n+l+d/2)}}; \quad (\cos\frac{r}{R})^{\Delta}(\sin\frac{r}{R})^l \to e^{-\frac{r^2p^+}{2}}(\frac{r}{R})^l \tag{4.13}$$

and using the limit (C.9) we have

$$\lim_{R\to\infty} P_n^{l+d/2-1,p^+R^2}(\cos(2r/R)) = L_n^{l+d/2-1}(p^+r^2) \tag{4.14}$$

and we get the wavefunctions for pp wave oscillators in spherical coordinates (with $p^+ = \mu\omega$) as obtained in (C.16).

Flat space vs. pp wave limits for S matrices

We saw that in the global AdS parametrization, AdS-CFT relates the AdS energy E with ω_{nl}/R, the spatial momentum direction in AdS_5, $\vec{k}/|\vec{k}|$ with $\hat{e}$, and the AdS mass m with Δ/R. Of course that means that we have to define R and the large R limit from SYM, but from the above information we deduced $2n/R = E - m$, so large n is the same as large R.

Notice that the above identifications are only true in the large n, large R limit. Otherwise,

$$(\Delta - \frac{d}{2})^2 = \frac{d^2}{4} + m^2R^2 \tag{4.15}$$

and extremality of correlators, $\Delta_1 = \sum_i \Delta_i$ means

$$\begin{aligned} m_1^2R^2 = (n-2)(n-1)\frac{d^2}{4} + \sum_i m_i^2R^2 + 2\sum_{ij}\sqrt{\frac{d^2}{4}+m_i^2R^2}\sqrt{\frac{d^2}{4}+m_j^2R^2} \\ +(n-2)d\sum_i\sqrt{\frac{d^2}{4}+m_i^2R^2} \end{aligned} \tag{4.16}$$

and we see that we recover $m_1 = \sum_i m_i$ in the large R limit.

But we notice that when we say mass, we mean 5d supergravity mass, which is related to the 10d mass M by

$$m_{AdS}^2 = M^2 + \tilde{k}_{S_5}^2 \tag{4.17}$$

To obtain the pp wave limit, we need to boost in an S_5 direction, but in a precise way.

If we rescale

$$\tilde{x}^- = \frac{x^-}{R};\ \tilde{x}^+ = \frac{x^+}{R} \Rightarrow 2p'^- = \frac{\bar{\Delta} - J}{R};\ 2p'^+ = \frac{\bar{\Delta}+J}{R};\ \ (2E = \frac{\bar{\Delta}}{R};\ 2p^\psi = \frac{J}{R}) \tag{4.18}$$

and keep p'^-, p'^+ finite (or E, p^ψ finite) in the large R limit, we get flat space. We need instead to rescale

$$\tilde{x}^- = \frac{x^-}{\mu R^2};\ \ \tilde{x}^+ = \mu x^+ \Rightarrow 2p^- = \mu(\bar{\Delta} - J);\ 2p^+ = \frac{\bar{\Delta}+J}{\mu R^2} \tag{4.19}$$

We still have

$$E_{AdS} = \frac{\bar{\Delta}}{R},\quad p_{S_5}^\psi = \frac{J}{R} \tag{4.20}$$

but they are not finite.

Notice that in both cases we get a finite

$$E^2 - p_\psi^2 = (2p^-)(2p^+) = (2p'^-)(2p'^+) = \frac{\bar{\Delta}^2 - J^2}{R^2} = M^2 + \vec{p}^{\,2}_{transv} = M^2 + \vec{k}^2_{(4),AdS} + \vec{k}^2_{(4),S} \tag{4.21}$$

We have written $\bar{\Delta}$ instead of Δ since there is a change of interpretation. Here

$$\bar{\Delta} = \omega_{nl} = \Delta + 2n + l \tag{4.22}$$

takes into account both the "off-shell index" n (radial AdS oscillator number for the pp wave case) and the angular momentum l, i.e. AdS directions oscillator numbers in spherical coordinates (as we saw). On the SYM R^4 plane, going from an operator $\mathcal{O}$ to $\mathcal{O}$ with insertions of $D_{(\mu_1}...D_{\mu_l)} - traces$ is equivalent on the cylinder $S^3 \times R_t$ to taking the l-th KK mode on S^3, i.e. one with spherical harmonic $Y_{l\vec{m}}$. We could have derivatives contracted with each other, and $2n$ corresponds to the number of contracted derivative insertions ($\sum_i N_{0i} = 2n + l$ in the pp wave case). Thus $\bar{\Delta}$ corresponds to taking also possible derivatives into account when counting the dimension of operators.

The momentum on S_5 is characterized in AdS by the spherical harmonic $Y_{l\vec{m}}(\tilde{e})$, and it corresponds in SYM on the cylinder (for global AdS) also to the $(l, \vec{m})$ representation of operators. For Poincare AdS, the S_5 momentum is determined in SYM by the number of Φ^i insertions (the same way as $Y_{lm}(\hat{e})$ corresponds to $D_\mu Z$ insertions), if they are in a large number (comparable to J).

In the flat space limit, spherical harmonics become free waves. For example, the "spherical harmonic" on a circle becomes

$$Y_J = e^{iJ\phi} = e^{\frac{iJy}{R}} \rightarrow e^{iky}; k \equiv \frac{J}{R} \tag{4.23}$$

For the 2-sphere we have $Y_{lm}(\theta, \phi)$ and large m is as before, whereas large l is similar, as $P_l(\cos\theta)$ becomes $\cos kx$. So in general, we can say that $Y_{J\vec{m}}(\tilde{e}) \rightarrow e^{i\tilde{\vec{k}}\cdot\vec{x}}$, thus the S^5 momentum is determined by $Y_{J\vec{m}}$, i.e. operators that are in a representation that corresponds to $Y_{J\vec{m}}$ will have momentum $\vec{k}$.

- In conclusion, if we want to take the flat space limit directly, we take fixed $E_{AdS} = \bar{\Delta}/R$. For $\Delta \sim 1$, n large, we get $m_{AdS} = 0$ S matrices [8]. For $m_{AdS} = \Delta/R$ fixed, we get nontrivial mass and/or momenta. The sphere momentum $\vec{k}^2_{S_5}$ is defined by large $J \sim R \sim (g^2_{YM}N)^{1/4}$ giving fixed p^ψ, and maybe large number of Φ insertions (giving extra momenta on S^5, in the directions perpendicular to ψ), $N_{\Phi_i} \sim (g^2N)^{1/4}$. The 10d mass M is obtained by the phases $e^{i\frac{2\pi nl}{J}}$ in the BMN operators [9], i.e. by having operators that have BMN phases and insertions on top of any representation corresponding to $Y_{J\vec{m}}$.

- If we want instead to get the pp wave limit, we have to keep fixed Δ/R^2. But

  $$\begin{aligned} &E^2_{AdS} - \vec{k}^2_{4,AdS} = m^2_{AdS} = p^2_\psi + \vec{k}^2_{4,S} + M^2 \Rightarrow \\ &E^2 = \frac{\Delta^2}{R^2} + 2\frac{\Delta}{R^2}(2n+l) + \frac{(2n+l)^2}{R^2} = m^2_{AdS} + 2\frac{\Delta}{R^2}(2n+l) + \frac{(2n+l)^2}{R^2} \end{aligned} \tag{4.24}$$

  So $n, l \sim 1$ in order to have finite $\vec{k}^2_{4,AdS} = 2\Delta/R^2(2n+l)$. Thus $\Delta \sim R^2, n \sim 1, l \sim 1$. The sphere momentum $\vec{k}^2_{S_5}$ is defined by $J \sim R^2 \sim (g^2_{YM}N)^{1/2}$ and by small number of Φ insertions (of order 1), that give the extra (discrete) momenta N_{0i}. Again, the 10d mass M is obtained by the phases $e^{i\frac{2\pi nl}{J}}$ in the BMN operators.

The difference between the pp wave limit and the flat space limit can be understood by looking at energy of string states in the pp wave,

$$-2p^- = \mu \sum_i N_{0i} + \mu \sum_i \sum_{n_i} \sqrt{1 + \frac{g_{YM}^2 N}{J^2}} = \sum_i \frac{p_i^2}{p^+} + \frac{M^2}{p^+} \tag{4.25}$$

If $N_{0i} \sim 1$, we get finite discrete p_i's ("momenta"), and if $J \sim g_{YM}^2 N$ we get finite mass $M_{\{n_i\}}$.

If on the other hand, $J \sim (g_{YM}^2 N)^{1/4}$, we get $p^+ \sim 1/R \sim (g_{YM}^2 N)^{-1/4}$, or rather, we have to redefine momenta to get finite results:

$$-2p'^- = \frac{2p^-}{\mu (g_{YM}^2 N)^{1/4}} = \sum_i \frac{N_{0i}}{(g_{YM}^2 N)^{1/4}} + \sum_i \sum_{n_i} \frac{(g_{YM}^2 N)^{1/4}}{J} n_i \tag{4.26}$$

and again we get discrete mass and discrete momenta, if $N_{0i} \sim (g_{YM}^2 N)^{1/4}$.

We have seen that the "off-shell index" n correponds after the pp wave or flat space limit to the radial oscillator number in the AdS directions (n and l are the spherical coordinate representation of the isotropic d-dimensional oscillator).

Since now we want a spacetime interpretation, for the S matrix, we need n since an AdS_5 on-shell state corresponds to an $S^3 \times R_t$ "off-shell" state (there is one extra degree of freedom, corresponding to the radial dimension). But we see that really the "off-shell" states are just reorderings of the on-shell states into a tower.

S matrix definition

In order to extract the S matrix we have to amputate external legs. Usually, the momentum space correlators have poles when the momenta are on-shell. But now as we saw, the bulk to boundary AdS propagator has poles when the external frequencies are normalizable (when CFT states are "on-shell").

So [8] devises a trick (that doesn't seem to work in Poincare coordinates) that converts the bulk to boundary propagators $K_{B\partial}$, which are (both in Poincare and in global coordinates) non-normalizable wavefunctions as we saw, into normalizable wavefunctions, thus defining the S matrix. One makes a time Fourier transform on the external legs of the AdS correlators, thus performing the same on the boundary leg of the bulk to boundary propagators, to $K_{B\partial}(\omega, \hat{e}; x')$.

Then one isolates one of the poles at external normalizable frequencies by first going to $l, \vec{m}$ space by integrating with $Y_{l\vec{m}}(\hat{e})$ and then defining

$$\hat{K}(n, l, \vec{m}, x) = \lim_{\omega \to \omega_{nl}} K_{B\partial}(\omega, l, \vec{m}, x) = -2\nu R^{d-1} e^{i\omega_{nl}\tau} k_{nl} \phi^*_{nl\vec{m}} \tag{4.27}$$

which is thus just a normalizable wavefunction, and finally going back to position space on the boundary leg by

$$\hat{K}(E, \hat{e}; x) = \sum_{l\vec{m}} Y_{l\vec{m}}(\hat{e}) \hat{K}(n, l, \vec{m}, x) \tag{4.28}$$

He showed then that this becomes the free (normalizable) wavefunction

$$K(E,\hat{e};x) \to \frac{C(E,R)}{(2\pi)^{d/2}} e^{i\vec{k}\vec{x}} \tag{4.29}$$

Thus in SYM the procedure corresponds to acting on the r-point correlator with

$$\prod_{j=1}^{r}(\sum_{l'_j\vec{m}'_j} Y_{l'_j\vec{m}'_j}(\hat{e}'_j))\prod_{i=1}^{r}(\lim_{p_i\to\omega_{n'_il'_i}}(p_i^2-\omega^2_{n'_il'_i})\int d\hat{e}_i Y^*_{l'_i\vec{m}'_i}(\hat{e}_i)) \tag{4.30}$$

However, as we just saw, the flat space limit works for the massive case as well, and we saw that the Fourier transform of the wavefunction is a free wave e^{ikx} even then.

To get the pp wave S matrix we apply the same procedure, but keeping $\Delta/R^2, n, l$ fixed. The wavefunctions work again, and we obtain the pp wave wavefunction, thus applying the procedure to SYM correlators for the previous limit generates pp wave S matrices. We also have to get an appropriate limit for the representation of the operators in the correlator (basically, take BMN operators).

5 (Extremal) Correlators and AdS S matrices

We will now analyze the correlators and see whether we can test this assumption. The pp wave (massive) case is quite involved, so we will study the massless case (flat space) of Giddings first, looking to apply the procedure to nonrenormalized correlators, so that we can test it. As we mentioned, these cases are the 2 and 3-point functions and the extremal correlators. The general extremal correlators are also the only ones that remain in the pp wave limit (meaning that they are related to S matrix observables). We will analyze them afterwards.

2- and 3-point functions

The momentum space free scalar two point function is

$$\int d^4x d^4y e^{iky+ipx}\frac{1}{|x-y|^2} = \int d^4y e^{iy(k+p)}\int d^4x' \frac{e^{ipx'}}{x'^2} = \delta^4(k+p)\frac{1}{p^2} \tag{5.1}$$

One could also put y to zero by translational invariance, then obtaining the two point function minus the momentum conservation

$$\int d^4x \frac{e^{ipx}}{x^2} = \frac{1}{p^2} \tag{5.2}$$

For the 3-point function,

$$f(x_1,x_2,x_3) = \frac{a_{123}}{x_{12}^a x_{13}^b x_{23}^c} \tag{5.3}$$

we have

$$
\begin{aligned}
f(p_1,p_2,p_3) &= \int d^4x_1 d^4x_2 d^4x_3 e^{i(p_1x_1+p_2x_2+p_3x_3)} f(x_1,x_2,x_3) \\
&= \int d^4x_1 e^{ix_1(p_1+p_2+p_3)} \int d^4x_{21} d^4x_{31} e^{i(p_2x_{21}+p_3x_{31})} f(x_{21},x_{31}) \\
&= \delta^4(p_1+p_2+p_3) a_{123} \int d^4x d^4y \frac{e^{ip_2x+ip_3y}}{x^a y^b |x-y|^c} \\
&= \delta^4(p_1+p_2+p_3) a_{123} f(|p_2|,|p_3|,\hat{e}_2\hat{e}_3)
\end{aligned} \tag{5.4}
$$

and again we get the overall delta function. It is however not a good idea to fix translational invariance in our case by putting one of the points to zero, since we need to use the Giddings procedure to extract S matrices.

Moreover now, for the global coodinate calculation in AdS, we need only to Fourier transform the SYM correlators in radial time. At the begining of the previous section, we also put one of the points near the origin (negative infinite radial time). If we don't put it to zero, the x-space SYM 2-point function corresponding to AdS global coordinates (i.e., on the cylinder) is now

$$
\frac{e^{ik(t_1+t_2)}}{|x_1-x_2|^{2k}} = \frac{1}{2^k} \frac{1}{(\cos(t_1-t_2) - \hat{e}_1\hat{e}_2)^k} \tag{5.5}
$$

But [8] showed that that expression is also equal to

$$
K_B(x,x') = c \int \frac{d\omega}{2\pi} \sum_{nl\vec{m}} e^{i\omega(t-t')} \frac{k_{nl}^2 Y_{l\vec{m}}^*(\hat{e}) Y_{l\vec{m}}(\hat{e}')}{\omega_{nl}^2 - \omega^2 - i\epsilon} \tag{5.6}
$$

where $\omega_{nl} = 2k + 2n + l$, and is actually valid even if $2k$ is not integer and is $= \Delta$. That means that the momentum space SYM 2-point function is

$$
< \mathcal{O}^{I_1}(p_1,\hat{e}_1); \mathcal{O}^{I_2}(p_2,\hat{e}_2) >= c\delta^{I_1I_2}\delta(p_1+p_2) \sum_{nl\vec{m}} \frac{k_{nl}^2 Y_{l\vec{m}}^*(\hat{e}_1) Y_{l\vec{m}}(\hat{e}_2)}{\omega_{nl}^2 - p_2^2 - i\epsilon} \tag{5.7}
$$

Incidentally, that also identifies n as an off-shell index. Indeed, from the above one sees that the states of the CFT on the cylinder are labelled by Δ and l, but also by this off-shell index n. At the free level, when $\Delta = 2k$, we can identify n with k, considered as indexing a tower of operators. At the interacting level, even n becomes non-integer, so it could still be indentified with the index of a tower of Δ_n.

Let us now look at the nonextremal (general) SYM 3-point function on the cylinder. The exact result is written in Appendix D.

Let us understand how does the summation and integration over one set of variables dissappear when $\alpha = 0$, i.e. for extremality. We see from (5.5) and (5.6) that $\alpha = 0$ implies one should have

$$
1 = -\int \frac{d\omega}{2\pi} \sum_{nl\vec{m}} e^{i\omega t} \frac{k_{nl}^2 Y_{l\vec{m}}^*(\hat{e}) Y_{l\vec{m}}(\hat{e}')}{\omega^2 - (2n+l)^2 - i\epsilon} \tag{5.8}
$$

From the expression for k_{nl} (D.3) we see that when $\alpha = 0$ and $d = 4$ we have a $\Gamma(-1)^2$ in the denominator, meaning that the coefficient is zero unless it's compensated. The integral over ω gives $1/2\omega_{nl} = 1/2(2n+l)$. If we put n=0 we get then a compensating infinity and obtain

$$-\sum_{l\vec{m}} \frac{1}{\Gamma(-1)^2} \frac{\Gamma(-1)\Gamma(l)}{0!\Gamma(l+2)} Y^*_{l\vec{m}}(\hat{e}) Y_{l\vec{m}}(\hat{e}') = -\frac{\Gamma(0)}{\Gamma(-1)} Y^*_{00}(\hat{e}) Y_{00}(\hat{e}') = 1 \tag{5.9}$$

where in the last line we had to select $l = 0$ as well.

This trivial calculation is of importance since that is what happens when we have extremal correlators: one of the α s becomes zero, and then the variables get reduced. Indeed, from the above simple calculation, we see that when $\alpha_1 = 0$, we select $n_1 = l_1 = 0$ and then the only nonzero term in the square brackets in (D.2) is the middle one, one puts $\omega_{n_1 l_1} = 0 = n_1 = l_1$ and recovers the extremal 3-point function result. Since we might need to make an analytic continuation to reach the extremal case, it is important to see the correct limit. (in Poincare coordinates, there was a continuation involved in getting the 3-point function, naively the result was zero in AdS, but there was an infinite integral coming from volume).

To deduce the S matrix a la Giddings we have now to act on the 3-point function with

$$\prod_{j=1}^{3} \Big(\sum_{l'_j \vec{m}'_j} Y_{l'_j \vec{m}'_j}(\hat{e}'_j)\Big) \prod_{i=1}^{3} \Big(\lim_{p_i \to \omega_{n'_i l'_i}} (p_i^2 - \omega^2_{n'_i l'_i}) \int d\hat{e}_i Y^*_{l'_i \vec{m}'_i}(\hat{e}_i)\Big) \tag{5.10}$$

We know that in that case on the AdS side we just get a momentum delta function for the 3-point S matrix, and in general we expect a momentum conservation anyway. In the 3-point case the delta function comes from the integrals of free waves e^{ikx}, and we generalize this representation of the delta function to higher n-point function cases, even though then the AdS calculation will be more involved. But we expect the S matrix to have an overall momentum conservation anyway. We will suppress the overall energy conservation which is obtained anyway, $\delta(p_1 + p_2 + p_3)$ or in general $\delta(p_1 + p_2 + ... + p_n)$.

In Appendix B we have shown how to write the delta function in a form appropriate for comparison with the SYM calculation.

Extremal correlators

The statement (conjecture?) about extremal correlators is that they do not receive corrections (as for the general 3-point function). The case generally treated is $k_1 = k_2 + ... + k_n$, since it's easier to analyze. Then

$$< \mathcal{O}^*(x_1)\mathcal{O}(x_2)...\mathcal{O}(x_n) >= \frac{a_{12...n}}{|x_{12}|^{2k_2}...|x_{1n}|^{2k_n}} \tag{5.11}$$

In the general extremal case ($k_1 + ... + k_n = k_{n+1} + ... + k_{n+m}$), the powers are more complicated. Note that if we put (by translational invariance) $x_1 = 0$ and go to $S^3 \times R$ and rotate to Lorentzian signature we get

$$< \mathcal{O}^*(t_1, \hat{e}_1)\mathcal{O}(t_2, \hat{e}_2)...\mathcal{O}(t_n, \hat{e}_n) >= a_{1...n} e^{ik_1 t_1 - ik_2 t_2 - ... - ik_n t_n} \tag{5.12}$$

For the general extremal correlator $k_1 + .. + k_n = \bar{k}_1 + ... + \bar{k}_m$ in the special case $|x_{1i}| \ll |x_{ij}|, i = 1, n; j = 1, m$ the powers (approximately) combine to give a similar answer:

$$< \mathcal{O}^*(t_1, \hat{e}_1 ... \mathcal{O}^*(t_n, \hat{e}_n)\mathcal{O}(\bar{t}_1, \hat{\bar{e}}_1)....\mathcal{O}(\bar{t}_m, \hat{\bar{t}}_m) >= a_{1...n;1...m} e^{ik_1t_1+...+ik_nt_n-i\bar{k}_1\bar{t}_1-...-i\bar{k}_m\bar{t}_m} \tag{5.13}$$

However, note that this answer is independent of $\hat{e}_i$, so cannot be correct. The point is that if we Fourier transform over the whole plane, we have the option of putting one coordinate to zero as we saw above for the 3-point function (all we miss is the overall delta function), or otherwise it gets shifted away anyway when integrating. But if we just Fourier transform over the energy, we can't.

Let us look at the extremal 3-point function ($k_1 = k_2 + k_3$) without fixing any point. The 3-point function on the Lorentzian cylinder, Fourier transformed in energy is

$$f_{123}(p_1, \hat{e}_1; p_2, \hat{e}_2; p_3, \hat{e}_3) = a_{123}\delta(p_1 + p_2 + p_3) \int dt'_2 \frac{e^{it'_2(p_2-k_2)}}{(1 + e^{-2it'_2} - 2e^{-it'_2}\hat{e}_1\hat{e}_2)^{k_2}}$$
$$\int dt'_3 \frac{e^{it'_3(p_3-k_3)}}{(1 + e^{-2it'_3} - 2e^{-it'_3}\hat{e}_1\hat{e}_3)^{k_3}} \tag{5.14}$$

here as before $t'_2 = t_{21}, t'_3 = t_{31}$ and we have the product of two free 2-point functions:

$$f_{123}(p_1, \hat{e}_1; p_2, \hat{e}_2; p_3, \hat{e}_3) = a_{123}\delta(p_1 + p_2 + p_3) \sum_{n_2 l_2 \vec{m}_2} \frac{k^2_{n_2 l_2} Y^*_{l_2 \vec{m}_2}(\hat{e}_1) Y_{l_2 \vec{m}_2}(\hat{e}_2)}{\omega^2_{n_2 l_2} - p_2^2 - i\epsilon}$$
$$\sum_{n_3 l_3 \vec{m}_3} \frac{k^2_{n_3 l_3} Y^*_{l_3 \vec{m}_3}(\hat{e}_1) Y_{l_3 \vec{m}_3}(\hat{e}_3)}{\omega^2_{n_3 l_3} - p_3^2 - i\epsilon} \tag{5.15}$$

And for the general extremal n-point function we similarly get

$$f_{12..r}(p_1, \hat{e}_1; p_2, \hat{e}_2; ...; p_r, \hat{e}_r) = a_{12...r}\delta(p_1 + p_2 + ... + p_r) \sum_{n_2 l_2 \vec{m}_2} \frac{k^2_{n_2 l_2} Y^*_{l_2 \vec{m}_2}(\hat{e}_1) Y_{l_2 \vec{m}_2}(\hat{e}_2)}{\omega^2_{n_2 l_2} - p_2^2 - i\epsilon} ...$$
$$\sum_{n_r l_r \vec{m}_r} \frac{k^2_{n_r l_r} Y^*_{l_r \vec{m}_r}(\hat{e}_1) Y_{l_r \vec{m}_r}(\hat{e}_r)}{\omega^2_{n_r l_r} - p_r^2 - i\epsilon} \tag{5.16}$$

Now we will apply the Giddings procedure [8] on the general 3-point function, and then particularize for the extremal correlators. Doing the spherical harmonic integrals we get

$$\sum_{m_1 m_2 m_3} \frac{1}{(4\pi)^{3/2}} (2l_1 + 1)(2l_2 + 1)(2l_3 + 1)\sqrt{(2l'_1 + 1)(2l'_2 + 1)(2l'_3 + 1)}(l_1 l_3 l'_2; m_1 m_3 m'_2)$$
$$(l_1 l_3 l'_2; 000)(l_1 l_2 l'_3; m_1 m_2 m'_3)(l_1 l_2 l'_3; 000)(l_2 l_3 l'_1; m_2 m_3 m'_1)(l_2 l_3 l'_1; 000) \tag{5.17}$$

Then multiplying with $p_i^2 - \omega^2_{n_i l_i}$ and taking the limit we pick out only certain terms in the sum over n,l: $l_2 + l_3 = l'_1, l_3 - l_1 = l'_2, l_1 + l_2 = l'_3$ (actually, only 2n+l is defined). Then, when taking the sum with

$$\sum_{l'_i m'_i} Y_{l'_1 m'_1}(\hat{e}_1) Y_{l'_2 m'_2}(\hat{e}_2) Y_{l'_3 m'_3}(\hat{e}_3) \tag{5.18}$$

we have fixed l s in terms of l' s, so we can't use the Gaunt formula in reverse! Notice though that one still remains with an unsaturated zero, coming from $p_1^2 - \omega_{n_1 l_1}^2$ (the rest cancel against the poles in the 3-point function).

In the extremal case we get the spherical harmonic integrals ($l_1 = m_1 = 0$)

$$\begin{aligned}&\int d\hat{e}_1 Y^*_{l_2 m_2}(\hat{e}_1) Y^*_{l_3 m_3}(\hat{e}_1) Y^*_{l'_1 m'_1}(\hat{e}_1) \int d\hat{e}_2 Y_{l_2 m_2}(\hat{e}_3) Y^*_{l'_3 m'_3}(\hat{e}_3) \int d\hat{e}_2 Y_{l_3 m_3}(\hat{e}_2) Y^*_{l'_2 m'_2}(\hat{e}_2)\\ &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{4\pi}} \sqrt{(2l_2+1)(2l_3+1)(2l'_1+1)} (l_2 l_3 l'_1; m_2 m_3 m'_1)^* (l_2 l_3 l'_1; 000)^* \delta_{l_2 l'_3}\\ &\delta_{m_2 m'_3} \delta_{l_3 l'_2} \delta_{m_3 m'_2}\end{aligned} \tag{5.19}$$

which easily generalizes to (renaming l_2 as l_3 and viceversa, in order to generalize)

$$I^*_{\{l_i m_i\} l'_1 m'_1} \delta_{l_2 l'_2} \delta_{m_2 m'_2} ... \delta_{l_n l'_n} \delta_{m_n m'_n} \tag{5.20}$$

So that the final result for the extremal S matrix from SYM is

$$\begin{aligned}&f_{12..r}(p_1, \hat{e}_1; p_2, \hat{e}_2; ...; p_r, \hat{e}_r) = a_{12...r} \delta(p_1 + p_2 + ... + p_r)\\ &\sum_{\{l'_i m'_i\}} k^2_{n'_2 l'_2} ... k^2_{n'_r l'_r} (p_1^2 - \omega^2_{n'_1 l'_1}) I_{\{l'_i, m'_i\} l'_1 m'_1} Y_{l'_1 m'_1}(\hat{e}_1) Y_{l'_2 m'_2}(\hat{e}_2) ... Y_{l'_r m'_r}(\hat{e}_r)\end{aligned} \tag{5.21}$$

which begins to look like (B.29) (we have both the spherical harmonics and the $I_{l_i m_i}$ term).

But we still have two operations to perform: to multiply with the coefficient giving the AdS 3-point function and to multiply with $C^{-1}(E_i, R)$.

The action

$$S = \frac{1}{2} \int \sum_I \eta_I [(\partial \phi_I)^2 + m^2 \phi_I^2] + \lambda \int \phi_1 \phi_2 \phi_3 \tag{5.22}$$

gives the two point function (see [29] and [31])

$$< \mathcal{O}\mathcal{O} >= \eta \frac{\Gamma(\Delta + 1)}{\pi^{d/2} \Gamma(\Delta - d/2)} \frac{2\Delta - d}{\Delta} \frac{1}{|x - y|^{2\Delta}} \equiv \frac{\eta f}{|x - y|^{2\Delta}} \tag{5.23}$$

and the 3-point function

$$\begin{aligned}&< \mathcal{O}_1 \mathcal{O}_2 \mathcal{O}_3 >= - \frac{\lambda}{|x - y|^{2\alpha_3} |y - z|^{2\alpha_1} |z - x|^{2\alpha_2}} \frac{\Gamma(\alpha_1)\Gamma(\alpha_2)\Gamma(\alpha_3)}{2\pi^d \Gamma(\Delta_1 - d/2)\Gamma(\Delta_2 - d/2)\Gamma(\Delta_3 - d/2)}\\ &\Gamma(\frac{\Delta_1 + \Delta_2 + \Delta_3 - d}{2}) \equiv - \frac{\lambda b}{|x - y|^{2\alpha_3} |y - z|^{2\alpha_1} |z - x|^{2\alpha_2}}\end{aligned} \tag{5.24}$$

It is not clear by what coefficient should we multiply in the general extremal case, since then it is not even clear what calculation one should do in AdS.

For the extremal 3-point function though, if a_{123} is the coefficient of the normalized 3-point function, then

$$a_{123} = \frac{\lambda b}{\sqrt{\eta_1 f_1 \eta_2 f_2 \eta_3 f_3}} \tag{5.25}$$

but for the S matrix we want to look only at the AdS 3-point function for $\lambda = 1$, i.e at the b coefficient, whereas in SYM we get the a_{123} coefficient, so we should multiply the SYM result by b/a_{123}. Putting also the $C^{-1}(E_i, R)$ factors we get for the 3-point S matrix

$$
\begin{aligned}
& f_{123}(p_1, \hat{e}_1; p_2, \hat{e}_2; p_3, \hat{e}_3) = \delta(p_1+p_2+p_3) \frac{\Gamma(\alpha_1)\Gamma(\alpha_2)\Gamma(\alpha_3)}{2\pi^d \Gamma(\Delta_1 - d/2)\Gamma(\Delta_2 - d/2)\Gamma(\Delta_3 - d/2)} \\
& \Gamma(\frac{\Delta_1+\Delta_2+\Delta_3-d}{2}) \sum_{\{l'_i m'_i\}} k^2_{n'_2 l'_2} k^2_{n'_3 l'_3} C_1^{-1} C_2^{-1} C_3^{-1} (p_1^2 - \omega^2_{n'_1 l'_1}) \\
& I_{\{l'_i, m'_i\} l'_1 m'_1} Y_{l'_1 m'_1}(\hat{e}_1) Y_{l'_2 m'_2}(\hat{e}_2) Y_{l'_3 m'_3}(\hat{e}_3)
\end{aligned}
\tag{5.26}
$$

In general be will have a factor analog to b, which presumably will also have a divergent $\Gamma(\alpha)$, so

$$
\begin{aligned}
& f_{12..r}(p_1, \hat{e}_1; p_2, \hat{e}_2; ...; p_r, \hat{e}_r) = b\delta(p_1 + p_2 + ... + p_r) \\
& \sum_{\{l'_i m'_i\}} k^2_{n'_2 l'_2} ... k^2_{n'_r l'_r} C_1^{-1} C_2^{-1} ... C_r^{-1} (p_1^2 - \omega^2_{n'_1 l'_1}) I_{\{l'_i, m'_i\} l'_1 m'_1} Y_{l'_1 m'_1}(\hat{e}_1) Y_{l'_2 m'_2}(\hat{e}_2) ... Y_{l'_r m'_r}(\hat{e}_r)
\end{aligned}
\tag{5.27}
$$

At large R,

$$
\begin{aligned}
C &\sim \frac{2^{2-\nu}}{\Gamma(\nu)} (-1)^{ER/2 - h_+} (ER)^{\Delta} \sim \frac{2^{2-\Delta+d/2}}{\Gamma(\Delta - d/2)} (-)^{n+l/2} (2n)^{\Delta} \\
k^2_{nl} &\sim \frac{2ER}{\Gamma(\nu+1)^2 R^{d-1}} (\frac{ER}{2})^{2\nu} \sim \frac{2^2}{\Gamma(\Delta - d/2 + 1)^2 R^{d-1}} n^{2\Delta - d + 1}
\end{aligned}
\tag{5.28}
$$

where the second expression as in terms of SYM parameters.

Then, using also $\Delta_2 + \Delta_3 = \Delta_1$ we get

$$
\begin{aligned}
& k_2^2 k_3^2 C_1^{-1} C_2^{-1} C_3^{-1} \sim (\frac{n_2}{n_1})^{\Delta_2 + 1 - d} (\frac{n_3}{n_1})^{\Delta_3 + 1 - d} \frac{2^{-3d/2-2}}{R^{2(d-1)} n_1^{2(d-1)}} \\
& \frac{1}{(\Delta_2 - d/2)^2 (\Delta_3 - d/2)^2} \frac{\Gamma(\Delta_1 - d/2)}{\Gamma(\Delta_2 - d/2)\Gamma(\Delta_3 - d/2)}
\end{aligned}
\tag{5.29}
$$

Now we also see how the zero in $p_1^2 - \omega_1^2$ is cancelled, since

$$
p_1^2 - \omega_1^2 \equiv p_1^2 - (\omega_2 + \omega_3)^2 \sim 2p_1 R(\Delta_2 + \Delta_3 - \Delta_1) = 4p_1 R\alpha_1
\tag{5.30}
$$

and that gets cancelled because $\Gamma(\alpha_1)\alpha_1 = 1$.

Putting everything together we get

$$
\begin{aligned}
& f_{123}(p_1, \hat{e}_1; p_2, \hat{e}_2; p_3, \hat{e}_3) = \delta(p_1+p_2+p_3) \frac{(p_2/p_1)^{\Delta_2+1-d} (p_3/p_1)^{\Delta_3+1-d}}{p_1^{2d-3}} \\
& \frac{2^{d/2-3}}{\pi^d R^{4d-5}} \frac{\Gamma(\Delta_2)\Gamma(\Delta_3)}{\Gamma(\Delta_2 - d/2 + 1)^2 \Gamma(\Delta_3 - d/2 + 1)^2} \Gamma(\Delta_2 + \Delta_3 - \frac{d}{2}) \\
& \sum_{\{l'_i m'_i\}} I_{\{l'_i, m'_i\} l'_1 m'_1} Y_{l'_1 m'_1}(\hat{e}_1) Y_{l'_2 m'_2}(\hat{e}_2) Y_{l'_3 m'_3}(\hat{e}_3)
\end{aligned}
\tag{5.31}
$$

Except for the numerical factors which are different, the angular and momentum dependence is the same as in (B.29), except for an extra factor of p_1 in the denominator, and if we fix the constants $c = 3n/2 - 2 + \sum_i b_i$ and put $0 = d - 5/2 - \Delta_i$. So we still need to find a procedure to somehow get rid of the unwanted factors (in d=4) of $(p_2/p_1)^{\Delta_2 - 3/2}(p_3/p_1)^{\Delta_3 - 3/2}$, and of the gamma functions containg numerical Δ factors. Conceivably, there should be a procedure that renormalizes the external legs such that we get the correct S matrix, as the angular momentum dependence was correct. Or maybe the problem is the fact that loop corrections modify the poles of the external propagators (as suggested by Giddings that could happen), and so maybe the residues are also modified, this giving the discrepancy that we found.

One should really analyze the massive and pp waves cases and obtain the massless flat space case as a limit.

6 Conclusions

In this paper we have analyzed the possibility to obtain S matrices on flat space and pp waves from SYM. The question of pp waves is of interest in several respects. First, it is a nontrivial gravitational background, and second, we have seen that the pp wave limit already focuses in on a geodesic in the middle of AdS, so the hardest problem in the case of the flat space limit (getting rid of the boundary contributions) seems already solved. Of course, we need to make sure that we are indeed in the pp wave limit.

For that, we have looked again at the argument that only extremal correlators survive the pp wave limit (in the same way that only large R charge operators survive it), at least as far as S matrices go. A puzzling statement in [26] that one can derive pp wave string amplitudes from nonextremal correlators was analyzed, and we showed that the amplitude is actually vanishing in the Penrose limit, and to get a nonzero result we are forced to the usual (extremal) string field theory calculations [14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20],...

We have defined S matrices on pp waves, generalizing a procedure due to Giddings [8], first to flat space with nonzero 5 dimensional (i.e. AdS) mass and then to pp waves. The procedure turns boundary-to-bulk propagators into normalizable wavefunctions, so we have checked that the AdS wavefunctions have the correct flat space and pp wave limits (and also that pp wave wavefunctions turn into flat space wavefunctions). There was previously no direct test of the procedure that we are aware of.

We have then tested the procedure on the correlators that we know are not renormalized: general scalar 2- and 3-point functions and extremal correlators. We have written down the general 3-point function, but we found that it is not obvious how to proceed in the general case (it is quite complicated, and the order of limits is highly nontrivial). We have then concentrated on the extremal 3-point function, the simplest case we can analyze, and also of relevance, since (with appropriate limits on the representation of operators) this correlator will survive the Penrose limit.

Taking the flat space limit on it though, we have found a discrepancy. The AdS side result is just a delta function, that we have expressed in spherical harmonics in order to compare with the SYM result. We have found that the angular dependence works, but we get extra gamma functions containing numerical Δ factors, as well as extra energy factors, (in d=4) of $(p_2/p_1)^{\Delta_2-3/2}(p_3/p_1)^{\Delta_3-3/2}$. We have seen that a similar thing will happen for the general extremal correlator (if we apply the flat space limit on it, not the pp wave limit!).

So what could be the reason for the discrepancy? Of course, one answer would be to say that the procedure is not good. Basically, we are turning bulk to boundary propagators into normalizable wavefunctions. But in AdS correlators the bulk to boundary propagators are integrated over the bulk points, and the flat space limit supposes that we sit at finite 5-th coordinate r, while taking $R \to \infty$. But since we integrate over all r's, we have to make sure that only the contribution of finite r survives. While the contribution near the boundary is negligible for normalizable wavefunctions, there is still a contribution at $r \sim R$ that is still far away from the boundary, and it is not obvious that is also small. One could maybe try to see how this affects the correlator. Another potential problem was already pointed out in [8], namely that loop corrections will modify the poles ω_{nl} that we have factorized near (in LSZ fashion) by (5.10). But we have chosen especially the extremal 3-point function for the certainty that the free result is exact, so at most it could be a question of defining properly the limit (maybe there is some subtlety that was missed before).

A final possibility would be that the flat space limit does not make sense on its own, but that the pp wave limit does (and that one needs to go first in the pp wave limit, and then maybe to flat space). We have not analyzed the pp wave limit on the extremal 3-point function ($\Delta \sim R^2, n \sim 1, l \sim 1$), and that could still give the right result. For the pp wave case, we know that at least the first quantized string picture (and the string field theory calculations) work, so maybe S matrices are also OK. For those calculations, we have also seen that we can understand the flat space limit better as a further limit of the pp wave (see e.g., [9, 13]), so maybe the same applies here. In any case, it is clear that further work is needed to define S matrices correctly.

Acknowledgements We would like to thank Juan Maldacena for pointing out to us that there is a problem with the definition of massless S matrices on the pp wave, and also to Radu Roiban for discussions. This research was supported in part by DOE grant DE-FE0291ER40688-Task A.

Appendix A. AdS holography review

In this Appendix we will review AdS-CFT correlators and holography in various coordinates. All the original correlator calculations were done in Euclidean space in Poincare coordinates for AdS. Things are somewhat simpler there, so we will start weith it.

Euclidean Poincare AdS

In Poincare coordinates,

$$ds^2 = \frac{R^2}{(x_0)^2}((d\vec{x})^2 + (dx_0)^2) \tag{A.1}$$

the bulk to bulk propagator is (from [32])

$$G(x,y) = (x_0 y_0)^{d/2} \int \frac{d^d k}{(2\pi)^d} e^{i\vec{k}\cdot(\vec{x}-\vec{y})} I_\nu(k x_0^<) K_\nu(k x_0^>) \tag{A.2}$$

and since $I_\nu(x) \sim x^\nu, K_\nu(x) \sim x^{-\nu}$ when $x \to 0$ we have that

$$G(x,y) \sim (x_0)^{d/2+\nu} = (x_0)^{2h_+} = (x_0)^\Delta \tag{A.3}$$

and consequently the bulk to boundary propagator is defined as

$$K_{B\partial}(\vec{x}, x_0; \vec{y}) = \lim_{y_0 \to 0} (y_0)^{-\Delta} G(x,y) \tag{A.4}$$

and is then given by (with normalization and notation from [26])

$$K_{B\partial}(\vec{x}, x_0; \vec{y}) \equiv < 0|\phi^I(\vec{x}, x_0) O^I(\vec{y}|0 >= [A(\Delta_I)]^{1/2} [\frac{x_0}{x_0^2 + (\vec{x}-\vec{y})^2}]^{\Delta_I} \tag{A.5}$$

which near the boundary behaves as $(x_0)^{d-\Delta}\delta(\vec{x}-\vec{y})$ where

$$(x_0)^{d-\Delta} = (x_0)^{d/2-\nu} = (x_0)^{2h_-} \tag{A.6}$$

as could have been inferred already from the form of G(x,y). Here

$$2h_\pm = \frac{d \pm \sqrt{d^2 + 4m^2 R^2}}{2} \tag{A.7}$$

are the solutions of $m^2 R^2 = 2h(2h-d)$ and represent the possible behaviours at infinity of the solutions of the plane wave equation $(\Box - m^2)\phi = 0$.

Let us now use an abuse of notation and split $\vec{x}$ into $(t, \vec{x})$. On the boundary, the euclidean $(\Box - m^2)\phi = 0$ would imply $k_0^2 + \vec{k}^2 + m^2 = 0$, which has no solution for real k_0. Since we have one extra (nontrivial) dimension, we can have solutions with real k_0 and $\vec{k}$.

The regular solution is

$$\phi \propto e^{ik_0 t + i\vec{k}\vec{x}} (x_0)^{d/2} K_\nu(|k| x_0) \phi_0(k_0, \vec{k}) \tag{A.8}$$

and as we saw above behaves as the boundary as $x_0^{2h_-}(1+...)+x_0^{2h_+}(1+...)$, hence the non-normalizable behaviour $x_0^{2h_-}$ dominates. There is also a solution with K_ν replaced by I_ν, which behaves as $x_0^{2h_+}$, so normalizable, but is badly behaved in the bulk (blows up exponentially at $x_0 \to \infty$).

Holography for Euclidean Poincare AdS

So there are two solutions of the AdS wave equation, a non-normalizable one with K_ν and a normalizable one (at the boundary) with I_ν, but which blows up in the bulk, thus is not good, and we can say there is a unique relevant solution.

We will see shortly that in Lorentzian AdS there are both normalizable and nonnormalizable modes, and they are dual to operator VEVs and sources, in a precise sense to be defined. But now, there are only non-normalizable modes, and as we saw, the bulk to boundary propagator behaved near the boundary like such a mode (or more precisely like a linear combination of these regular modes), so these modes generate sources $\phi_0(\vec{y})$ on the boundary via

$$\phi(\vec{x},x_0)=\int d^d y K(\vec{x},x_0;\vec{y})\phi_0(\vec{y})=c\int d^d y\frac{x_0^{2h_+}}{(x_0^2+(\vec{x}-\vec{y})^2)^{2h_+}}\phi_0(\vec{y})\sim(x_0)^{d-\Delta}\phi_0(\vec{x}) \quad (A.9)$$

Thus boundary correlators in AdS (from $\phi_0(\vec{y})$ derivatives of the AdS partition function) are related to correlators on the boundary (from $\phi_0(\vec{y})$ derivatives of the SYM partition function).

However, because of the AdS-CFT dictionary relating euclidean generating functionals we get also a one-point function (operator VEV) induced by the same source ϕ_0 (so this is not an independent quantity).

$$<\mathcal{O}(\vec{x})>_{\phi_0}=-c(2h_+)\int d^d y\frac{\phi_0(\vec{y})}{|\vec{x}-\vec{y}|^{2(2h_+)}} \quad (A.10)$$

Lorentzian Poincare AdS

As we mentioned, in Lorentzian signature the situation is a bit more involved due to the presence of normalizable modes. It was analyzed first in [33], where the general idea was put forward, and then in [34] where the details were worked out.

In Lorentzian signature then for $k^2=-\omega^2+\vec{k}^2>0$ the solution is the same as for the Euclidean case. But on the boundary we want $(\Box-m^2)\phi=0$ which means $-\omega^2+\vec{k}^2+m^2=0$, meaning that the relevant solution is for $k^2=-\omega^2+\vec{k}^2<0$, so for the physical case we need to analytically continue the Euclidean solution. There are then two solutions,

$$\Phi^\pm \propto e^{-i\omega t+i\vec{k}\vec{x}}(x_0)^{d/2}J_{\pm\nu}(|k|x_0) \quad (A.11)$$

when $\nu=\sqrt{d^2+4m^2R^2}/2$ is not integral and $J_{\pm\nu}$ replaced by Y_ν when it's integral. Since $J_\nu(x)\sim x^\nu$ around x=0, Φ^- behaves like $(x_0)^{2h_-}$ and is non-normalizable, as the euclidean solution. But now we also have Φ^+ which behaves like $(x_0)^{2h_+}$ and is normalizable (and also well defined in the interior, unlike in the Euclidean case).

The propagators are the obvious analytical continuation of the Euclidean Poincare propagators.

Holography for Lorentzian Poincare AdS

Now the dictionary is a bit more involved. As in Euclidean space, the non-normalizable modes in the bulk define sources on the boundary, but now one can add normalizable modes in the bulk field which don't affect the source (have subleading behaviour) but affect the one-point function (operator VEV)

$$\phi(x_0,\vec{x}) = \phi_n(x_0,\vec{x}) + c\int d^dy \frac{x_0^{2h_+}}{(x_0^2+(\vec{x}-\vec{y})^2)^{2h_+}}\phi_0(\vec{y}) \tag{A.12}$$

where $\phi_n(x_0,\vec{x}) \to (x_0)^{2h_+}\tilde{\phi}_n(\vec{x})$ and

$$<\tilde{\phi}_n|\mathcal{O}(\vec{x})|\tilde{\phi}_n>_{\phi_0} = (2h_+)\tilde{\phi}_n(\vec{x}) + c(2h_+)\int d^dy \frac{\phi_0(\vec{y})}{|\vec{x}-\vec{y}|^{2(2h_+)}} \tag{A.13}$$

At the operatorial level, the bulk field (normalizable mode)

$$\hat{\phi}_n = \sum_k [a_k\phi_{n,k} + a^+\phi^*_{n,k}] \tag{A.14}$$

is thus mapped to the operator (acting as a field)

$$\hat{\mathcal{O}} = \sum_k [b_k\tilde{\phi}_{n,k} + b_k^+\tilde{\phi}^*_{n,k}] \tag{A.15}$$

where we can identify the operators $a_k = b_k$, and the operator acts on a coherent state $|\tilde{\phi}_n> = e^{ct.b_k^+}|0>$.

The short form of this statement (from [35]) is that non-normalizable modes are mapped to sources and normalizable modes to VEVs (or states), so that

$$\phi \sim a_i(x_0)^{d-\Delta} + b_i(x_0)^{\Delta} \tag{A.16}$$

implies

$$H = H_{CFT} + a_i\mathcal{O}_i \tag{A.17}$$

and

$$<0|\mathcal{O}|0> = b_i \text{or rather} \quad <b_i|\mathcal{O}_i|b_i> = b_i + (a_i \text{ piece}) \tag{A.18}$$

The very important consequence is that if we put the non-normalizable mode to zero (no sources) and look at a bulk configuration (probe) which corresponds to a combination of normalizable modes (maybe with non-normalizable components as well), it will get mapped to a VEV of the dual operator.

In particular, examples of probes studied in [34] are D-instantons, fundamental and D-strings, and dilaton wavepackets. For instance, the D-instanton goes near the boundary as

$$\begin{aligned} e^{\phi} &\sim g_s + c\frac{x_0^4 \tilde{x}_0^4}{[\tilde{x}_0^2 + |\vec{x} - \vec{y}|^2]^4}\cdots \\ \chi &= \chi_\infty \pm (e^{-\phi} - 1/g_s) \end{aligned} \tag{A.19}$$

and implies a VEV for the operator coupling to ϕ

$$\frac{1}{4g_{YM}^2} < TrF^2(\vec{x}) >= \frac{48}{g_{YM}^2}\frac{\tilde{x}_0^4}{[\tilde{x}_0^2 + |\vec{x} - \vec{y}|^2]^4} \tag{A.20}$$

which is just the formula for the YM instanton! Moreover, this is an example of scale-radius duality, since the radial position of the D-instanton, $\tilde{x}_0$ is mapped to the scale of the instanton.

If we put the normalizable mode to zero instead, we get the same $\phi(\vec{x}, x_0)$ and $< \mathcal{O} > |_{\phi_0}$ as in Euclidean Poincare AdS, and boundary AdS correlators are related in the same way to SYM correlators.

Global Lorentzian AdS

In global coordinates,

$$ds^2 = R^2(-cosh^2\mu dt^2 + d\mu^2 + sinh^2\mu d\Omega_{d-1}^2) \tag{A.21}$$

or, with $tan\rho = sinh\mu$,

$$ds^2 = \frac{R^2}{cos^2\rho}(-dt^2 + d\rho^2 + \sin^2\rho d\Omega_{d-1}^2) \tag{A.22}$$

The boundary is now at $\rho = \pi/2$. The solutions to the wave equation are written as

$$\Phi = e^{-i\omega t}Y_{l,\{m\}}(\Omega)\chi(\rho) \tag{A.23}$$

where Y_l are spherical harmonics on S^{d-1}, $\nabla^2_{S^{d-1}}Y_l = -l(l+d-2)Y_l$, and can be analyzed near the origin and the boundary. At the boundary, we find solutions $\Phi^\pm$ that behave as $\Phi^\pm \sim (cos\rho)^{2h_\pm}$. But at the origin, only one of the solutions $\Psi_{1,2}$ that we find is regular, namely one that can be written as $\Psi_1 = C^+\Phi^+ + C^-\Phi^-$.

So the unique regular solution is in general non-normalizable (since Φ^- is nonnormalizable), but we get a quantization condition from $C^- = 0$ for which we get normalizable solutions. The condition is

$$\omega_{nl} = 2h_+ + 2n + l \tag{A.24}$$

where n is a positive integer (or zero). Then the solutions are normalizable and their asymptotic behaviour is (with the notation in [8])

$$\chi_{nl}(\rho)\sqrt{2\omega_{nl}} \to k_{nl}(cos\rho)^{2h_+} \tag{A.25}$$

So whereas in Poincare coordinates the Lorentzian wave equation has continous normalizable solutions (as well as non-normalizable ones), in global coordinates the general case is non-normalizable, and particular cases are normalizable.

Somewhat similar to the Poincare case, in the global case the bulk to bulk propagator is

$$iG(x,y) = \int \frac{d\omega}{2\pi} \sum_{nl\vec{m}} e^{i\omega(t-t')} \frac{\phi^*_{nl\vec{m}}(\vec{x})\phi_{nl\vec{m}}(\vec{y})}{\omega_{nl}^2 - \omega^2 - i\epsilon} \tag{A.26}$$

which again behaves like a normalizable mode towards the boundary, so the bulk to boundary propagator is

$$K_{B\partial}(\vec{y},x) = 2\nu R^{d-1} lim_{\rho' \to \pi/2} (cos\rho')^{2h_+} iG(x,y) \tag{A.27}$$

and near the boundary behaves like a non-normalizable mode,

$$K_{B\partial}(\vec{y},x) \sim (cos\rho)^{2h_-} \delta(\vec{x} - \vec{y}) \tag{A.28}$$

and can be written as (note that on the boundary -and not only- we parametrize $\vec{x} = (t, \hat{e})$ where $\hat{e}$ takes values in Ω_{d-1})

$$K_{B\partial}(\vec{y},x) = 2\nu R^{d-1} \int \frac{d\omega}{2\pi} \sum_{nl\vec{m}} e^{i\omega(t-t')} \frac{k_{nl} Y^*_{l\vec{m}}(\hat{e})\phi_{nl\vec{m}}(\vec{x})}{\omega_{nl}^2 - \omega^2 - i\epsilon} \tag{A.29}$$

The propagator can also be rewritten as

$$K_{B\partial}(\vec{y},x) = K_B [\frac{\cos^2\rho}{[cos^2(t-t') - sin\rho \hat{e}\hat{e}']^2 + i\epsilon}]^{h_+} \tag{A.30}$$

Holography in global Lorentzian AdS

Lorentzian global AdS has as a boundary the cylinder $S_3 \times R$, and the CFT in R^4 is mapped to the cylinder, and dimensionally reduced on S^3 to a QM Hamiltonian.

Non-normalizable modes (general frequencies ω) correspond, as before, to sources for the CFT operators, whereas at special frequencies, normalizable modes correspond to the states of the CFT on the cylinder.

$$\omega_{nl} = \Delta + 2n + l \tag{A.31}$$

Cylinder $(t, \vec{u})$ AdS

Finally, [26] uses a third coordinate system which is important since one can take the pp wave limit more easily in it. We will therefore write down the sphere part of the gravity metric explicitly as well. They make the coordinate change from Euclidean Poincare AdS

$$e^\tau = (x_0^2 + \vec{x}^2)^{1/2}, \quad \vec{u} = \vec{x}/x_0 = u\hat{e} \tag{A.32}$$

where now the boundary of AdS is at $u = \infty$ and is parametrized by

$$e^\tau = |x|, \quad \hat{e} = \vec{x}/|x| \tag{A.33}$$

followed by the Wick rotation to Lorentzian signature $\tau \to (1-i\epsilon)it$. One gets the $AdS\times S$ metric (with the sphere written in Wick-rotated analogous coordinates)

$$ds^2 = R^2(-(1+u^2)dt^2 + d\vec{u}d\vec{u} - \frac{u^2du^2}{1+u^2}) + R^2((1-v^2)d\psi^2 + d\vec{v}d\vec{v} + \frac{v^2dv^2}{1-v^2}) \tag{A.34}$$

As we mentioned, on the boundary we change coordinates from the plane (corresponding to Euclidean Poincare in AdS) to the $S^3\times R$ cylinder (corresponding to the $(t,\vec{u})$ cylinder as well as global coordinates in AdS) via $x_i = e^\tau \hat{e}_i, \tau = it$. Then the change of coordinates $u = sinh\mu = tan\rho$ takes us to the usual global coordinates defined before. One can also easily check that the Poincare bulk to boundary propagator becomes in these coordinates (just modifying the position of the $i\epsilon$) as the one in [26] (with a different normalization)

$$K(t,\vec{u};t',\hat{e}') = \frac{(A(\Delta))^{1/2}}{2^\Delta(\sqrt{1+u^2}cos[(1-i\epsilon)(t-t')] - \vec{u}\hat{e})^\Delta} \tag{A.35}$$

Then, in between this coordinate system and the Euclidean Poincare coordinate system the only difference is that we need to make a conformal transformation on the operator on the boundary, which changes from the plane (for Poincare) to the cylinder (for $(t,\vec{u})$ coordinates), so multiply by $e^{\Delta\tau} = e^{i\Delta t}$.

A very important observation is that if we put $t' = -\infty$ (or $\vec{y} = 0$) in the bulk to boundary propagator before making the coordinate change to the $(t,\vec{u})$ cylinder (actually before the Wick rotation, really), the propagator becomes

$$K(t,\vec{u};-\infty,\hat{e}') = (A(\Delta))^{1/2}[e^{-it}(1+u^2)^{-1/2}]^\Delta \tag{A.36}$$

which is different from what we will get if we just put $t' = -\infty$ in the bulk-to-boundary propagator. This will be very important later on (in the main text).

Appendix B. Delta function in spherical harmonics

In this Appendix we rewrite the delta function in a way that could match the SYM calculation, namely expanding in spherical harmonics.

The spatial momentum delta function in global AdS parametrization is (the time integral would give the energy conservation, so we are left with a 4d space integral in global AdS)

$$\begin{aligned}
&(2\pi)^d\delta^d(p_1\hat{e}_1 + p_2\hat{e}_2 - p_3\hat{e}_3) = \int d^dx e^{i(p_1r\hat{e}_1\hat{e}' + p_2r\hat{e}_2\hat{e}' - p_3r\hat{e}_3\hat{e}')} \\
&= \sum_{l_1\vec{m}_1l_2\vec{m}_2l_3\vec{m}_3} i^{l_1+l_2+l_3}(2\pi)^{-3d/2}Y_{l_1\vec{m}_1}(\hat{e}_1)Y_{l_2\vec{m}_2}(\hat{e}_2)Y_{l_3\vec{m}_3}(-\hat{e}_3) \\
&\int d\vec{e}' Y_{l_1\vec{m}_1}(\hat{e}')Y_{l_2\vec{m}_2}(\hat{e}')Y_{l_3\vec{m}_3}(\hat{e}') \\
&\int r^{d-1}dr\frac{J_{l_1+d/2-1}(p_1r)J_{l_2+d/2-1}(p_2r)J_{l_3+d/2-1}(p_3r)}{(p_1p_2p_3r^3)^{d/2-1}}
\end{aligned} \tag{B.1}$$

where we have actually expressed the exponentials in the form we got them from the AdS propagators, as Bessel functions and spherical harmonics (the solution in spherical coordinates). Substituting d=4 and generalizing to arbitrary number of external momenta we get

$$\sum_{l_i\vec{m}_i} i^{l_1+l_2+...+l_n}(2\pi)^{-2n}Y_{l_1\vec{m}_1}(\hat{e}_1)Y_{l_2\vec{m}_2}(\hat{e}_2)...Y_{l_n\vec{m}_n}(-\hat{e}_n)\int d\vec{e}' Y_{l_1\vec{m}_1}(\hat{e}')Y_{l_2\vec{m}_2}(\hat{e}')...Y_{l_n\vec{m}_n}(\hat{e}')$$
$$\frac{1}{p_1...p_n}\int_0^\infty r^{3-n}dr J_{l_1+1}(p_1r)J_{l_2+1}(p_2r)...J_{l_n+1}(p_nr) \tag{B.2}$$

At this point we can use the formula (from [36])

$$\int_0^\infty \prod_j [J_{\mu_j}(b_jx)]\{\cos[(\rho+\sum_j\mu_j-\nu)\pi/2]J_\nu(ax)$$
$$+\sin[(\rho+\sum_j\mu_j-\nu)\pi/2]Y_\nu(ax)\}\frac{x^{\rho-1}}{x^2+k^2}dx = -\prod_j I_{\mu_j}(b_jk)K_\nu(ak)k^{\rho-2} \tag{B.3}$$

which applies if $Re(k)>0, a>\sum_j|Reb_j|, Re(\rho+\sum_j\mu_j)>|Re(\nu)|$. As we can see we apply this formula for $k\to 0$ (real) $b_i=p_i$, $\mu_i=l_i+1$, $\nu=l_n+1$, $a=p_n$, $\rho=6-n$. The first condition is satisfied, the second is satisfied only as a limit, since $p_n=p_1+...+p_{n-1}$ is just energy conservation. The last condition becomes $4+\sum_{i=1}^{n-1}l_i-l_n>0$, and finally one needs $4+\sum_{i=1}^{n-1}l_i-l_n=2m$ (even number) so that we only have the J_{l_n+1} term, and not the Y term. Then (using that at $x\sim 0$ we have $I_\nu(x)\simeq(x/2)^\nu 1/\Gamma(\nu+1), K_\nu(x)\simeq(x/2)^{-\nu}\Gamma(\nu)/2$)

$$\int_0^\infty r^{3-n}dr J_{l_1+1}(p_1r)J_{l_2+1}(p_2r)...J_{l_n+1}(p_nr)$$
$$=-\frac{l_n!}{(\prod_{i=1}^{n-1}(l_i+1)!)2^{\sum_i l_i-l_n+n-1}}\frac{\prod_j p_j^{l_j+1}}{p_n^{l_n+1}}\lim_{k\to 0}k^{\sum_i l_i-l_n+2} \tag{B.4}$$

In the n=3 case, we get

$$-\frac{l_3!}{(l_1+1)!(l_2+1)!2^{l_1+l_2-l_3+2}}p_1^{l_1+1}p_2^{l_2+1}p_3^{-l_3-1}\lim_{k\to 0}k^{l_1+l_2-l_3+2} \tag{B.5}$$

This formula can be checked against another formula for 3 Bessel integral from [36], valid for $p_3>p_1+p_2$, so still used as a limit in our case $p_3=p_1+p_2$,

$$\int_0^\infty dx J_{l_1+1}(p_1x)J_{l_2+1}(p_2x)J_{l_3+1}(p_3x)=\frac{p_1^{l_1+1}p_2^{l_2+1}p_3^{-l_1-l_2-3}\Gamma(\frac{l_1+l_2+l_3}{2}+2)}{(l_1+1)!(l_2+1)!\Gamma(\frac{l_3-l_1-l_2}{2})}$$
$$F_4(\frac{l_1+l_2-l_3}{2}+1,\frac{l_1+l_2+l_3}{2}+2,l_1+2,l_2+2;p_1^2/p_3^2,p_2^2/p_3^2)$$
$$=\frac{p_1^{l_1+1}p_2^{l_2+1}p_3^{-l_1-l_2-3}\Gamma(\frac{l_1+l_2+l_3}{2}+2)}{(l_1+1)!(l_2+1)!\Gamma(\frac{l_3-l_1-l_2}{2})}{}_2F_1(\frac{l_1+l_2-l_3}{2}+1,\frac{l_1+l_2+l_3}{2}+2,l_1+2,x)$$
$${}_2F_1(\frac{l_1+l_2-l_3}{2}+1,\frac{l_1+l_2+l_3}{2}+2,l_2+2,y) \tag{B.6}$$

where $x(1-y) = p_1^2/p_3^2, y(1-x) = p_2^2/p_3^2$, and therefore if $p_3 = p_1 + p_2$ we have $x = p_1/p_3$ and $y = p_2/p_3$. One then uses that ${}_2F_1(0, ...) = 1$ and ${}_2F_1(-m, ...) =$ polynomial to check against the general n formula.

Finally, for the spherical harmonics integrals appearing on both sides one should use some technology derived strictly speaking for S_2, but which should hold in general. The Gaunt formula,

$$Y_{l_1m_1}(\hat{e})Y_{l_2m_2}(\hat{e}) = \sum_l \sqrt{\frac{(2l_1+1)(2l_2+1)}{4\pi(2l+1)}} < l_1l_2m_1m_2|lm >< l_1l_200|l0 > Y_{lm}(\hat{e}) \tag{B.7}$$

is derived from the identification of

$$Y_{lm}\sqrt{\frac{2l+1}{4\pi}}\bar{D}^l_{m0}(\hat{e}) \tag{B.8}$$

where $D^j_{mm'}(R)$ is the representation R of the rotation group acting on ψ_{jm}. Then one deduces ($Y_{l-m}(\hat{e}) = (-)^m Y^*_{lm}(\hat{e})$)

$$\int d\hat{e} Y_{l_1m_1}(\hat{e})Y_{l_2m_2}(\hat{e})Y_{l_2m_3}(\hat{e}) = (-)^{m_3}\sqrt{\frac{(2l_1+1)(2l_2+1)}{4\pi(2l_3+1)}}$$
$$< l_1l_2m_1m_2|l_3m_3 >< l_1l_200|l_30 > \tag{B.9}$$

or using the Wigner 3-j symbols

$$(j_1, j_2, j_3; m_1, m_2, -m_3) = (-)^{j_1-j_2+m}/\sqrt{2j+1} < j_1j_2m_1m_2|jm > \tag{B.10}$$

it is

$$\frac{1}{\sqrt{4\pi}}\sqrt{(2l_1+1)(2l_2+1)(2l_3+1)}(j_1, j_2, j_3; m_1, m_2, m_3)(j_1, j_2, j_3; 0, 0, 0) \tag{B.11}$$

By repeated application of the Gaunt formula we get

$$I_{\{l_im_i\}} \equiv \int d\hat{e} Y_{l_1m_1}(\hat{e})Y_{l_2m_2}(\hat{e})...Y_{l_{n-1}m_{n-1}}(\hat{e})Y_{l_nm_n}(\hat{e}) = \frac{1}{(4\pi)^{n/2-1}}\sqrt{(2l_1+1)...(2l_n+1)}$$
$$(2l'_2+1)...(2l'_{n-2}+1)(l_1l_2l'_2; m_1, m_2, m'_2)(l_1l_2l'_2; 000)$$
$$(l'_2l_3l'_3; m'_2m_3m'_3)(l'_2l_3l'_3; 000)...(l'_{n-2}l_{n-1}l_n; m'_{n-2}m_{n-1}m_n)(l'_{n-2}l_{n-1}l_n; 000) \tag{B.12}$$

and then

$$(2\pi)^4\delta^4(p_1\hat{e}_1 + p_2\hat{e}_2 + ... - p_n\hat{e}_n)$$
$$= -\sum_{l_i\vec{m}_i} i^{l_1+l_2+...+l_n}(2\pi)^{-2n}Y_{l_1\vec{m}_1}(\hat{e}_1)Y_{l_2\vec{m}_2}(\hat{e}_2)...Y_{l_n\vec{m}_n}(-\hat{e}_n)$$
$$I_{\{l_im_i\}}\frac{l_n!}{(\prod_{i=1}^{n-1}(l_i+1)!)2^{\sum_i l_i - l_n + n-1}}\frac{\prod_j p_j^{l_j}}{p_n^{l_n+2}}\lim_{k\to 0} k^{\sum_i l_i - l_n + 2}$$
$$= -\sum_{l_i\vec{m}_i} i^{l_1+l_2+...+l_n}(2\pi)^{-2n}Y_{l_1\vec{m}_1}(\hat{e}_1)Y_{l_2\vec{m}_2}(\hat{e}_2)...Y_{l_n\vec{m}_n}(-\hat{e}_n)$$
$$I_{\{l_im_i\}}\frac{(\sum l_i + 2)!}{(\prod_{i=1}^{n-1}(l_i+1)!)2^{n-3}}\frac{1}{p_n^4}\prod_j(\frac{p_j}{p_n})^{l_j} \tag{B.13}$$

and that is the decomposition of the delta function in spherical harmonics, which should be matched with SYM.

In the last line we have replaced $l_n = \sum l_i + 2$ to make the power of k =0, but notice that then strictly speaking the result is zero, since the quantity $I_{\{l_i,m_i\}}$ composes angular momenta, so we see that it satisfies the generalized 'triangle' inequalities, in particular $l_n \leq \sum l_i$. Moreover, we see that for $l_n > \sum l_i + 2$ we have a divergent result (even though the summation makes it zero).

But in order to calculate Bessel function integrals we have to take various limits (like the $k \to 0$ limit), and then maybe we have to take into account the effect of high l's. Indeed, the delta function should be zero most of the time. Since we are working for $p_n = \sum p_i$, this representation of the delta function should be nonzero only if $\hat{e}_i = \hat{e}_n$ for all i.

But there seems to be only one way that this is achieved: for different $\hat{e}_i$'s, we can always find a sufficiently high but finite l above which the sum over spherical harmonics averages out (since the numerical coefficient will be approximately constant and the spherical harmonics themselves will oscillate drastically, like sin($l\ \phi$), for instance). Since for finite l's we saw that the sum is zero, the whole result is zero at different $\hat{e}_i$'s. But when all $\hat{e}_i$'s are exactly the same, we can't find any finite l above which the spherical harmonics average out.

So we will only calculate the contribution from l going to infinity, and moreover since now there is no formula for the Bessel function integrals, we will assume that the finite l formula holds, except that now we neglect the 2 and have $l_n = \sum l_i$, and also keep a possible divergent factor, that is, (with $l_i = a_i m, m \to \infty$)

$$\begin{aligned}
&\frac{1}{p_1 ... p_n} \int_0^\infty r^{3-n} dr J_{l_1+1}(p_1 r) J_{l_2+1}(p_2 r) ... J_{l_n+1}(p_n r) \\
&= -\frac{(\sum l_i + 2)!}{(\prod_{i=1}^{n-1}(l_i+1)!) 2^{n-3}} \frac{1}{p_n^4} \prod_j (\frac{p_j}{p_n})^{l_j} (1/k)
\end{aligned} \tag{B.14}$$

Note that [36] have also the explicit formulas

$$\int_0^\infty dx x^{\nu - M + 1} J_\nu(bx) \prod_{i=1}^k J_{\mu_i}(a_i x) = 0, \quad M = \sum_i \mu_i \tag{B.15}$$

which applies if $b = p_n > \sum p_i = \sum_i a_i$ (and therefore as a limit for the equality case), to give

$$\int_0^\infty dr r^{3-n} J_{l_1+1}(p_1 r) ... J_{l_n+1}(p_n r) = 0 \text{ if } l_n = \sum l_i \tag{B.16}$$

(if $l_n - \sum l_i \neq 0$ one adds it to the power of r) and similarly

$$\int_0^\infty dx x^{\nu - M - 1} J_\nu(bx) \prod_{i=1}^k J_{\mu_i}(a_i x) = 2^{\nu - M - 1} b^{-\nu} \Gamma(\nu) \prod_{i=1}^k \frac{a_i^{\mu_i}}{\Gamma(1+\mu_i)} \tag{B.17}$$

implying

$$\int_0^\infty dr r^{3-n(+l_n - \sum l_i - 2)} J_{l_1+1}(p_1 r) ... J_{l_n+1}(p_n r) = 2^{l_n - \sum l_i - n + 1} \frac{l_n!}{p_n^{l_n+1}} \prod_i \frac{p_i^{l_i+1}}{(l_i+1)!} \tag{B.18}$$

which is exactly what we obtained from the other formula, for $l_n = \sum_i l_i + 2$.

Moreover, we can check directly what happens at large l, using the formula for large ν

$$J_\nu(\frac{\nu}{\cosh\alpha}) = \frac{e^{\nu\tanh\alpha - \nu\alpha}}{\sqrt{2\pi\nu\tanh\alpha}}\{1 + \frac{1}{\nu}(1/8\coth\alpha - 5/24\coth^3\alpha) + ...\} \tag{B.19}$$

Use $\nu = xe^\alpha$ for $\alpha \to \infty$, x fixed to get

$$J_\nu(x/2) \simeq x^\nu \frac{e^\nu}{\nu^\nu\sqrt{2\nu\pi}} \tag{B.20}$$

and therefore at large l's

$$\int_0^\infty drr^{3-n}\prod_i J_{l_i+1}(p_i r) = \prod_{i=1}^n\left[\frac{e^{l_i+1}p_i^{l_i+1}}{(l_i+1)^{l_i+1}\sqrt{2\pi(l_i+1)}}\right]\int_0^\infty drr^{3-n+\sum(l_i+1)} \tag{B.21}$$

which we will see has a form similar to our extrapolation of the finite l Bessel integral formula, up to the divergent factor. We use the Sterling formula to find that the product is $\prod_i p_i^{l_i+1}/(l_i+1)!$ (including n). Putting the exponent of r to -1 (least divergent), thus formally $l_n + 1 = -(\sum_i l_i + 3)$, gives the same formula as from the finite l extrapolation, with an indeterminate factor $(\int dr/r)/\Gamma(0)$.

Going back to our extrapolated formula, the numerical coefficient of the $l\vec{m}$ sum at large l can be evaluated using the Sterling formula

$$l_j! \simeq (l_j+1)^{l_j+1/2}e^{-l_j-1}\sqrt{2\pi} \tag{B.22}$$

Then (substituting $l_i = ma_i$)

$$\begin{aligned}&\frac{1}{p_n^4 2^{n-3}}[\frac{l_n!}{\prod_i(l_i+1)!}\prod_j(\frac{p_j}{p_n})^{l_j}] = \\ &\frac{(2\pi)^{1-n/2}}{p_n^4 2^{n-3}}e^{(ma_n+1/2)\ln(ma_n+1)-\sum_i(ma_i+3/2)\ln(ma_i+2)-l_n+\sum l_i+2n-3+\sum_j l_j ln(p_j/p_n)}\end{aligned} \tag{B.23}$$

and the exponent becomes, in an m expansion (introducing also a nonzero $b_i = l_i - ma_i$ and $c = l_n - ma_n$ for use further on, but skipped in the following equations)

$$\begin{aligned}&m\ln m(a_n - \sum a_i) + m(a_n\ln a_n - \sum_i a_i\ln a_i + \sum_j a_j\ln p_j/p_n + \sum_i a_i - a_n) \\ &-\frac{\ln m}{2}(3n - 4 + 2\sum_i b_i - 2c) + \frac{1}{2}(\ln a_n - 3\ln(\prod_i a_i)) + cln\ a_n \\ &-\sum_i b_i ln\ a_i + \sum_j b_j ln\frac{p_j}{p_n}\end{aligned} \tag{B.24}$$

If we substitute $a_n = \sum a_i$ (since we need $l_n \leq \sum l_i$, but for finite l that gives zero, so we will define $a_n = \sum a_i$, and the l's can differ by a finite amount), the exponent is

$$mf(a_i) - \frac{\ln m}{2}(3n-4) + \frac{1}{2}(\ln(\sum a_i) - 3\ln(\prod a_i)) \tag{B.25}$$

where

$$f(a_i) = (\sum_i a_i)\ln(\sum_i a_i) - \sum_i a_i \ln(a_i) + \sum_j a_j \ln(p_j/p_n) \tag{B.26}$$

then the maximum of f is defined by

$$\frac{\partial f}{\partial a_i} = \ln(\frac{a_n p_i}{a_i p_n}) = 0 \to \frac{a_i}{a_n} = \frac{p_i}{p_n} \Rightarrow f(a_{i,max}) = 0 \tag{B.27}$$

since then $\partial^2 f/\partial a_i^2 = 1/a_n - 1/a_i < 0$.

Since we are dealing with the coefficient of a divergent quantity (m), it makes sense to keep only the values in the sum over l's where the coefficient is maximum, so we substitute $a_i/a_n = p_i/p_n$. But then the m term vanishes, and we are left with only ln m and constant terms in the exponent. But now note that these terms depend on how we define a_i's, in particular whether $l_n = \sum l_i + c$ with nonzero c (or $l_n = m(\sum a_i) + c$), and also whether $l_i = ma_i + b_i$. With nonzero c and b_i the exponent is

$$-\ln m \frac{3n-4-2c+2b_i}{2} - \frac{1}{2}\ln\frac{\prod_i (a_i)^{3+2b_i}}{a_n^{1+2c}} + \sum_j b_j \ln\frac{p_j}{p_n} \tag{B.28}$$

and so

$$\begin{aligned}&(2\pi)^4\delta^4(p_1\hat{e}_1 + p_2\hat{e}_2 + ... - p_n\hat{e}_n)\\ &= -\sum_{l_i\vec{m}_i} i^{l_1+l_2+...+l_n}(2\pi)^{-2n} Y_{l_1\vec{m}_1}(\hat{e}_1)Y_{l_2\vec{m}_2}(\hat{e}_2)...Y_{l_n\vec{m}_n}(-\hat{e}_n)\\ &I_{\{l_i m_i\}}\frac{(2\pi)^{1-n/2}}{p_n^4 2^{n-3}}[m^{c+2-3n/2-\sum_i b_i}\frac{a_n^{c+1/2}}{\prod_i (a_i)^{3/2+b_i}}]\prod_j(\frac{p_j}{p_n})^{b_j}\end{aligned} \tag{B.29}$$

Notice that if one takes $c = 3n/2 - 2 + \sum_i b_i$ two nice things happen: the divergent m factor dissapears and the square brackets become only momentum dependent (using $a_i/a_n = p_i/p_n$)

$$[\prod_i (\frac{p_n}{p_i})^{3/2}] \tag{B.30}$$

Appendix C. Identities for limits of wavefunctions

For the flat space and pp wave limits of wavefunctions in section 4, we need to find the limits for

$$\lim_{n\to\infty}\frac{1}{n^\alpha}P_n^{\alpha,\beta}(cos(x/n)) \text{ and } \lim_{n\to\infty}\frac{1}{n^\alpha}P_n^{\alpha,n\beta}(cos(x/n)) \tag{C.1}$$

where $P_n^{\alpha,\beta}$ are Jacobi polynomials, since these appear in the AdS wavefunctions, as well as the limits of spherical harmonics of large l for the sphere wave functions, as well as the limits for Hermite polynomials for the case of flat space limit of the pp wave.

$$P_n^{\nu,\mu}(x) = \frac{(-)^n}{2^n n!}(1-x)^{-\nu}(1+x)^{-\mu}\frac{d^n}{dx^n}\{(1-x)^{\nu+n}(1+x)^{\mu+n}\} \tag{C.2}$$

Then for $x \to 1-x$ and expanding in powers in the brackets and taking derivatives we get

$$P_n^{\nu,\mu}(1-x) = \frac{(1-x/2)^{-\mu}}{n!}\sum_{m\geq 1}\frac{(-x/2)^m}{m!}(\mu+n)...(\mu+n-m+1)(\nu+n+m)...(\nu+m+1) \quad (C.3)$$

Then one gets

$$\lim_{n\to\infty}\frac{1}{n^\alpha}P_n^{\alpha,\beta}(cos(x/n)) = \sum_{m\geq 1}\frac{(-)^m(x/2)^{2m}}{m!\Gamma(\alpha+m+1)} = (\frac{2}{x})^\alpha J_\alpha(x) \quad (C.4)$$

and similarly

$$\lim_{n\to\infty}\frac{1}{n^\alpha}P_n^{\alpha,n\beta}(cos(x/n)) = \sum_{m\geq 1}\frac{(-)^m(\sqrt{1+\beta}\frac{x}{2})^{2m}}{m!\Gamma(\alpha+m+1)} = (\frac{2}{x\sqrt{1+\beta}})^\alpha J_\alpha(x\sqrt{1+\beta}) \quad (C.5)$$

For the Hermite polynomials one has

$$\begin{aligned}&\lim_{n\to\infty}\frac{1}{n^\alpha}L_n^\alpha(x/n) = x^{-\alpha/2}J_\alpha(2\sqrt{x})\\ &H_{2n}(x) = (-)^n 2^{2n} n! L_n^{-1/2}(x^2)\\ &H_{2n+1}(x) = (-)^n 2^{2n+1} n! x L_n^{1/2}(x^2)\end{aligned} \quad (C.6)$$

which implies

$$\begin{aligned}&\lim_{n\to\infty}\frac{(-)^n\sqrt{n}}{2^{2n}n!}H_{2n}(\frac{x}{\sqrt{n}}) = \sqrt{\frac{2}{\pi}}cos(2x)\\ &\lim_{n\to\infty}\frac{(-)^n}{\sqrt{n}2^{2n+1}n!}H_{2n+1}(\frac{x}{\sqrt{n}}) = \sqrt{\frac{2}{\pi}}sin(2x)\end{aligned} \quad (C.7)$$

For the pp wave limit of AdS wavefunctions, we first write an alternative version for $P_n^{\nu,\mu}(1-x)$. We replace $x \to 1-x$ in (C.2) and first take derivatives (and not expand), we get

$$P_n^{\nu,\mu}(1-x) = \frac{1}{2^n}\sum_{m=0}^{n}\begin{pmatrix} n+\nu \\ m \end{pmatrix}\begin{pmatrix} n+\mu \\ n-m \end{pmatrix}(-x)^{n-m}(2-x)^m \quad (C.8)$$

Then one gets

$$\lim_{a\to\infty}P_n^{\nu,\alpha a}(\cos\frac{2r}{\sqrt{a}}) = \sum_{m=0}^{n}\begin{pmatrix} n+\nu \\ n-m \end{pmatrix}\frac{(-\alpha r^2)^m}{m!} = L_n^\nu(\alpha r^2) \quad (C.9)$$

where $L_n^\nu(x)$ are Laguerre polynomials.

The d-dimensional harmonic oscillator in spherical coordinates has the Schrodinger equation

$$(-\Delta + \mu^2\omega^2 r^2 - 2\mu E)\Phi = (-\frac{\partial^2}{\partial r^2} + \frac{d-1}{r}\frac{\partial}{\partial r} + \frac{1}{r^2}\Delta_{S_{d-1}})\Phi = 0 \quad (C.10)$$

with the separated solution

$$\Phi_{nl\vec{m}} = \chi_{nl}(r) Y_{l\vec{m}}(\hat{e}) \tag{C.11}$$

and the radial equation

$$\{-[\frac{d^2}{dr^2} + \frac{d-1}{r}\frac{d}{dr} - \frac{l(l+d-2)}{r^2}] + \mu^2\omega^2 r^2 - 2\mu E_n\}\chi_{nl}(r) = 0 \tag{C.12}$$

Separating the small r behaviour $\chi \sim r^\alpha \Rightarrow \alpha = l$ and the large r behaviour $\chi = e^{-r^2\mu\omega/2}$, i.e.

$$\chi = r^l e^{-r^2\mu\omega/2} G(r) \tag{C.13}$$

one finds for G in $z = \sqrt{r}$ variables the equation

$$zG'' + G'[l + d/2 - z(\mu\omega)] + g[\frac{\mu E_n}{2} - \frac{\mu\omega}{2}(l + d/2)] = 0 \tag{C.14}$$

which is the Laguerre equation, provided we have the quantization condition

$$E_n - \omega(l + d/2) = 2n \tag{C.15}$$

thus the d dimensional harmonic oscillator in spherical coordinates has the wavefunctions

$$\Phi_{nl\vec{m}} = N_{nl} r^l e^{-\mu\omega r^2/2} L_n^{l+d/2-1}(\mu\omega r^2) Y_{l\vec{m}}(\hat{e}) \tag{C.16}$$

Appendix D. General 3-point function of scalars

Take

$$\int \frac{dt_1 dt_2 dt_3}{(2\pi)^3} e^{i(p_1t_1+p_2t_2+p_3t_3)} \frac{a_{123} e^{i(k_1t_1+k_2t_2+k_3t_3)}}{|x_{12}|^{2\alpha_3}|x_{13}|^{2\alpha_2}|x_{23}|^{2\alpha_1}} \tag{D.1}$$

Using that $k_1t_1 + k_2t_2 + k_3t_3 = \alpha_1(t_2+t_3) + \alpha_2(t_1+t_3) + \alpha_3(t_1+t_2)$ and then using (5.5) and (5.6) as well as shifting as usual by t_1 and making the t_1 integral to get the delta function we get

$$
\begin{aligned}
& a_{123}\delta(p_1+p_2+p_3)\int\frac{d\omega_1}{2\pi}\frac{d\omega_2}{2\pi}\frac{d\omega_3}{2\pi}\int\frac{dt_{21}}{2\pi}e^{it_{21}(p_2-\omega_3+\omega_1)}\int\frac{dt_{31}}{2\pi}e^{it_{31}(p_3-\omega_2-\omega_1)} \\
& \sum_{n_3l_3\vec{m}_3}\frac{k_{n_3l_3}^2 Y_{l_3\vec{m}_3}^*(\hat{e}_1)Y_{l_3\vec{m}_3}(\hat{e}_2)}{\omega_3^2-\omega_{n_3l_3}^2-i\epsilon}\sum_{n_1l_1\vec{m}_1}\frac{k_{n_1l_1}^2 Y_{l_1\vec{m}_1}^*(\hat{e}_2)Y_{l_1\vec{m}_1}(\hat{e}_3)}{\omega_1^2-\omega_{n_1l_1}^2-i\epsilon}\sum_{n_2l_2\vec{m}_2}\frac{k_{n_2l_2}^2 Y_{l_2\vec{m}_2}^*(\hat{e}_1)Y_{l_2\vec{m}_2}(\hat{e}_3)}{\omega_2^2-\omega_{n_2l_2}^2-i\epsilon} \\
& = a_{123}\delta(p_1+p_2+p_3)\int\frac{d\omega_1}{2\pi}\sum_{n_3l_3\vec{m}_3}\frac{k_{n_3l_3}^2 Y_{l_3\vec{m}_3}^*(\hat{e}_1)Y_{l_3\vec{m}_3}(\hat{e}_2)}{(p_2+\omega_1)^2-\omega_{n_3l_3}^2-i\epsilon} \\
& \sum_{n_1l_1\vec{m}_1}\frac{k_{n_1l_1}^2 Y_{l_1\vec{m}_1}^*(\hat{e}_2)Y_{l_1\vec{m}_1}(\hat{e}_3)}{\omega_1^2-\omega_{n_1l_1}^2-i\epsilon}\sum_{n_2l_2\vec{m}_2}\frac{k_{n_2l_2}^2 Y_{l_2\vec{m}_2}^*(\hat{e}_1)Y_{l_2\vec{m}_2}(\hat{e}_3)}{(p_3-\omega_1)^2-\omega_{n_2l_2}^2-i\epsilon} \\
& = a_{123}\delta(p_1+p_2+p_3)\sum_{n_1l_1n_2l_2n_3l_3}k_{n_1l_1}^2k_{n_2l_2}^2k_{n_3l_3}^2 \\
& (\sum_{\vec{m}_1}Y_{l_1\vec{m}_1}^*(\hat{e}_2)Y_{l_1\vec{m}_1}(\hat{e}_3))(\sum_{\vec{m}_2}Y_{l_2\vec{m}_2}^*(\hat{e}_1)Y_{l_2\vec{m}_2}(\hat{e}_3))(\sum_{\vec{m}_3}Y_{l_3\vec{m}_3}^*(\hat{e}_1)Y_{l_3\vec{m}_3}(\hat{e}_2)) \\
& [\frac{1}{2\omega_{n_3l_3}}\frac{1}{(p_2\mp\omega_{n_3l_3})^2-\omega_{n_1l_1}^2}\frac{1}{(p_2+p_3\mp\omega_{n_3l_3})^2-\omega_{n_2l_2}^2} \\
& +\frac{1}{2\omega_{n_1l_1}}\frac{1}{(p_2\pm\omega_{n_1l_1})^2-\omega_{n_3l_3}^2}\frac{1}{(p_3\mp\omega_{n_1l_1})^2-\omega_{n_2l_2}^2} \\
& +\frac{1}{2\omega_{n_2l_2}}\frac{1}{(p_3+p_2\mp\omega_{n_2l_2})^2-\omega_{n_3l_3}^2}\frac{1}{(p_3\mp\omega_{n_2l_2})^2-\omega_{n_1l_1}^2}]
\end{aligned}
\tag{D.2}
$$

where in the second line we did the $t_{21}, t_{31}, \omega_2, \omega_3$ integrals and in the last line also the ω_1 integral and the $\pm, \mp$ indicate a sum of terms over the two values. Here

$$
k_{nl}^2=\frac{2\omega_{nl}}{R^{d-1}}\frac{\Gamma(n+\alpha+1-\frac{d}{2})\Gamma(n+l+\alpha)}{n!\Gamma(n+l+\frac{d}{2})}\frac{1}{\Gamma(\alpha+1-\frac{d}{2})^2}
\tag{D.3}
$$

and at large R in the [8] case (large n, fixed α and l) we have

$$
\frac{k_{nl}^2R^{d-1}}{2\omega_{nl}}\sim\frac{n^{2\alpha-d}}{\Gamma(\alpha+1-\frac{d}{2})^2}=(\frac{ER}{2})^{2\nu}\frac{1}{\Gamma(\nu+1)^2}
\tag{D.4}
$$

Note that doing the sums over m's we could rewrite the spherical harmonics as $Y_{l_1}(\hat{e}_2\cdot\hat{e}_3)Y_{l_2}(\hat{e}_1\cdot\hat{e}_3)Y_{l_3}(\hat{e}_1\cdot\hat{e}_2)$, where $Y_l(\cos\alpha)$ is $P_l(\cos\alpha)$.

References

[1] J. Maldacena, "The large N limit of superconformal field theories and supergravity," Adv. Theor. Math. Phys. 2 (1998) 231; Int. J. Theor. Phys. 38 (1999) 1113 and hep-th/9711200

[2] E. Witten, "Anti de Sitter space and holography," Adv. Theor. Math. Phys. 2 (1998) 253 and hep-th/9802150

[3] S.S. Gubser, I.R. Klebanov and A.M. Polyakov, "Gauge theory correlators from non-critical string theory," Phys. Lett. B428 (1998) 105 and hep-th/9802109.

[4] J. Polchinksi, "S-matrices from AdS spacetime, and hep-th/9901076

[5] L. Susskind, "Holography in the flat-space limit," and hep-th/9901079

[6] V. Balasubramanian, S.B. Giddings and A. Lawrence, "What do CFT's tell us about anti-de-Sitter spacetimes?" JHEP 9903 (1999) 001 and hep-th/9902052

[7] S.B. Giddings, "The boundary S-matrix and the AdS to CFT dictionary," Phys. Rev. Lett. 83 (1999) 2707 and hep-th/9903048.

[8] S.B. Giddings, "Flat space scattering and bulk locality in the AdS-CFT correspondence," Phys. Rev. D61 (2000) 106008 and hep-th/9907129

[9] D. Berenstein, J. Maldacena and H. Nastase, "Strings in flat space and pp waves from $\mathcal{N} = 4$ Super Yang Mills", JHEP 0204 (2002) 013 and hep-th/0202021

[10] S.R. Das, C. Gomez and S.J. Rey, "Penrose limit, spontaneous symmetry breaking and holography in pp wave background," Phys. Rev. D66 (2002) 046002 and hep-th/0203164

[11] E. Kiritsis and B. Pioline, "Strings in homogeneous gravitational waves and null holography," JHEP 0208 (2002) 048 and hep-th/0204004

[12] R.G. Leigh, K. Okuyama and M. Rozali, "PP-waves and holography," Phys. Rev. D66 (2002) 046004 and hep-th/0204026

[13] D. Berenstein and H. Nastase, On light-cone string field theory from Super Yang-Mills and holography, hep-th/0205048

[14] N.R. Constable, D.Z. Freedman, M. Headrick, S. Minwalla, L. Motl, A. Postnikov and W. Skiba, "PP-wave string interactions from perturbative Yang-Mills theory," JHEP 0207 (2002) 017 and hep-th/0205089

[15] N.R. Constable, D.Z. Freedman, M. Headrick and S. Minwalla, "Operator mixing and the BMN correspondence," JHEP 0210 (2002) 068 and hep-th/0209002.

[16] C. Kristjansen, J. Plefka, G. W. Semenoff and M. Staudacher, “A New Double-Scaling Limit of N=4 Super Yang-Mills Theory and PP-Wave Strings,” Nucl. Phys. B643 (2002) 3 and hep-th/0205033

[17] N. Beisert, C. Kristjansen, J. Plefka, G. W. Semenoff and M. Staudacher, “BMN correlators and operator mixing in N=4 Super Yang-Mills theory,” Nucl. Phys. B650 (2003) 125 and hep-th/0208178.

[18] M. Spradlin and A. Volovich, “Superstring interactions in a pp-wave background,” Phys. Rev. D66 (2002) 086004 and hep-th/0204146.

[19] M. Spradlin and A. Volovich, “Superstring interactions in a pp-wave background II,” JHEP 0301 (2003) 036 and hep-th/0206073.

[20] J. Pearson, M. Spradlin, D. Vaman, H. Verlinde and A. Volovich, “Tracing the string: BMN correspondence at finite J^2/N,” JHEP 0305 (2003) 022 and hep-th/0210102.

[21] D.Sadri and M.M. Sheikh-Jabbari, “The Plane-Wave/Super Yang-Mills duality,” hep-th/0310119.

[22] S. Dobashi, H. Shimada and T. Yoneya, “Holographic reformulation of string theory on $AdS_5 \times S^5$ background in the PP-wave limit,” Nucl. Phys. B665 (2003) 94 and hep-th/0209251.

[23] S. Dobashi and T. Yoneya, “Resolving the holography in the plane-wave limit of AdS/CFT correspondence,” hep-th/0406225.

[24] S. Dobashi and T. Yoneya, “Impurity non-preserving 3-point correlators of BMN operators from PP-Wave holography I : Bosonic excitations,” hep-th/0409058.

[25] D. Bak and M.M. Sheikh-Jabbari, “Strong evidence in favor of the existence of S-Matrix for strings in plane waves”, JHEP 0302 (2003) 019 and hep-th/0211073

[26] N. Mann and J. Polchinski, AdS holography in the Penrose limit, hep-th/0305230

[27] E.D’Hoker, D.Z. Freedman, S.D. Mathur, A. Matusis and L. Rastelli, “Extremal correlators in the AdS-CFT correspondence,” hep-th/9908160

[28] H. Liu, A.A. Tseytlin, “Dilaton-fixed scalar correlators and $AdS_5 \times S_5$-SYM correspondence,” JHEP 9910:003, and hep-th/9906151

[29] S. Lee, S. Minwalla, M. Rangamani and N. Seiberg, “Three point functions of chiral operators in D=4, $\mathcal{N}$=4 SYM at large N,” Adv. Theor. Math. Phys. 2 (1998) 697 and hep-th/9806074

[30] S. Cremonini and A. Donos, “Cubic interactions in the BMN limit of $AdS_3 \times S_3$,” Phys. Rev. D70 (2004) 044016 and hep-th/0402052

[31] D.Z. Freedman, S.D. Mathur, A. Mathusis and L. Rastelli, "Correlation functions in the CFT_d/AdS_{d+1} correpondence," Nucl. Phys. B546 (1999) 96 and hep-th/9804058.

[32] H. Liu and A.A. Tseytlin, "On Four-point Functions in the CFT/AdS Correspondence," Phys. Rev. D59 (1999) 086002 and hep-th/9807097.

[33] V. Balasubramanian, P. Kraus and A. Lawrence, "Bulk vs. boundary dynamics in Anti-de Sitter spacetime," Phys. Rev. D59 (1999) 046003 and hep-th/9805170

[34] V. Balasubramanian, P. Kraus, A. Lawrence and S.P. Trivedi, "Holographic probes of Anti-de Sitter spacetimes," Phys. Rev. D59 (1999) 104021 and hep-th/9808017

[35] J. Polchinski and M.J. Strassler, "The string dual of a confining four-dimensional gauge theory," het-th/0003136.

[36] I.S. Gradshteyn and I.M. Ryzhik, "Table of integrals, series and products," 6th edition, Academic Press, 2000.